DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 356 RC 003 576

By-Briscoe, May E.; Archambo, Judith P.
Rural Child Care Project. 1967-1968 Research Evaluation. Final Report.
Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation, Inc., Frankfort.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Report No-F-OEO-4205
Pub Date 15 Apr 69
Note-357p.
EDRS Price MF-$1.50 HC-$17.95
Descriptors-Caseworkers, *Child Care, *Child Care Centers, Child Development Centers, Child Development Specialists, *Comparative Testing, Culturally Disadvantaged, Disadvantaged Youth, Methodology, *Preschool Education, Rural Family, *Rural Youth, Statistical Data
Identifiers-Eastern Kentucky

The focus of the Rural Child Care Project is culturally disadvantaged children and their families in 10 Appalachian counties of Eastern Kentucky. Research evaluation of the Project during 1967-68 had 4 major objectives: (1) to assess the relationship between a child's attendance in a Child Development Center and his subsequent intellectual performance and academic achievement; (2) to assess the effect of the combined casework, homemaking, and day care services on families of children who had been exposed to the Child Development Program; (3) to ascertain the image of the Project in participating counties; and (4) to evaluate the effectiveness of the subprofessional staff in providing Project services to the culturally disadvantaged child and his family. Results are discussed in terms of these objectives. The hypotheses and methodology used in assessing results are given along with tables incorporating the statistical data. Problems are defined and a review of relevant literature is given. The appendices include copies of questionnaires, education and attitude scales, and instructions for judging the results of these scales. (EV)

F. OEO-4205

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
AUG 22 1969
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

RURAL CHILD CARE PROJECT

1967-1968 Research Evaluation

Contract No. OEO-4205

FINAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: May E. Briscoe

Assisted By: Judith P. Archambo, Ph.D.

INSTITUTION : Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 713
Frankfort, Kentucky

TRANSMITTED BY : George Perkins, Executive Director

April 15, 1969

RC 003 376

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables i

List of Appendices vii

Acknowledgements 1

Abstract 2

Problem 3

Literature Review 5

Hypotheses 12

I. Intellectual Functioning of Former Rural Child Care Project Participants: Follow-up Comparisons of Stanford-Binet I.Q. Scores 14

II. Achievement Functioning of Former Rural Child Care Project Participants: Follow-up Comparisons of California Achievement Test Scores 35

III. Household Conditions Rating Survey 62

IV. Child Rearing Attitudes of Project Parents 93

V. Attitudes Toward Education of Rural Child Care Project Parents. 104

VI. Community Survey 111

VII. Evaluation of the Resident Non-Professional Staff. 120

Summary. 131

Bibliography 133

Appendices 137

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Frequency and Percentage of Children in the Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 Groups by 1967-1968 School District of Enrollment and County of Residence 16

2. Mean Stanford-Binet I.Q. Scores of Former Rural Child Care Project Participants (N=38) Obtained While Enrolled in the Child Development Center Program (1966) and in First (1967) and Second (1968) Grades (Including Grade 1 Repeaters). 17

3. Difference Scores Depicting I.Q. Change for Former Project Participants (N=38) 17

4. Mean Stanford-Binet I.Q. and Mean Chronological Age at First, Second and Third Testing of the 1967-1968 "First Grade Repeaters" and "Second Grade" Groups 19

5. Comparison Between Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 Groups Classified According to Initial Stanford-Binet I.Q. (Above 80 Versus 80 or Below) on Six Covariates 20

6. Mean Stanford-Binet I.Q. Change as a Function of Grade Placement Status During 1967-1968 and Initial Stanford-Binet I.Q. 21

7. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: I.Q. Change Between the First and Second Administrations of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale as a Function of Grade Placement Status During 1967-1968 and Initial Stanford-Binet I.Q. 22

8. Summary of 1965-1966 Child Development Center (CDC) Attendance Information on the 1967-1968 "First Grade Repeater" and "Second Grade" Groups 24

9. Comparison Between Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 Groups Classified According to Prior and Interim Child Development Center Attendance on Four Covariates 25

10. Mean Stanford-Binet I.Q. Change as a Function of Grade Placement Status During 1967-1968 and Previous Attendance at a Child Development Center (CDC) 26

Table Page

11. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: I.Q. Change Between the First and Third Administrations of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale as a Function of Grade Placement Status During 1967-1968 and Previous Attendance at a Child Development Center. 27

12. Comparison of the Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 - Above 80 Initial I.Q. - Matched Subgroups on Matching Variables . . 29

13. Stanford-Binet I.Q. Scores and Chronological Age at Testing (in Months) for Matched Pairs of Grade 2 and Grade 1 Repeaters Whose Initial I.Q. Scores were Above 80. 30

14. Mean Stanford-Binet I.Q. Change for Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 Matched Subgroups. 31

15. Reasons Subjects were Excluded from C.A.T. Sample (n=104). 37

16. Children used in the C.A.T. Analyses by County, School, Grade and Treatment (n=201). 37

17. Summary of Data Obtained on the Title I Questionnaire Sent to County Title I Coordinators, June-July, 1968: Services and Equipment Supported by Title I Funds in Grades One and Two, 1967-1968. 41

18. Mean Chronological Age at C.A.T. Testing for Subjects Classified by County, School, Grade Placement and Treatment 44

19. Mean Grade Placement Equivalent Scores (Total Battery) for Subjects Tested on the C.A.T. Classified According to County, School, Grade Placement and Treatment Group. . . . 44

20. Mean Grade Placement Equivalent Scores (Reading) for Subjects Tested on the C.A.T. Classified According to County, School, Grade Placement and Treatment Group. . . . 45

21. Mean Grade Placement Equivalent Scores (Arithmetic) for Subjects Tested on the C.A.T. Classified According to County, School, Grade Placement and Treatment Group. . . . 45

22. Mean Grade Placement Equivalent Scores (Language) for Subjects Tested on the C.A.T. Classified According to County, School, Grade Placement and Treatment Group. . . . 46

23. Mean C.A.T. Scores of First Graders as a Function of Socioeconomic Status (SES) and Prior Participation in the Project. 48

Table | Page

24. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score as a Function of Rated Socioeconomic Status and Prior Participation in the Project. 48

25. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score as a Function of Rated Socioeconomic Status and Prior Participation in the Project 49

26. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score as a Function of Rated Socioeconomic Status and Prior Participation in the Project 49

27. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Total Raw Score as a Function of Rated Socioeconomic Status and Prior Participation in the Project 49

28. Mean C.A.T. Scores of Second Graders as a Function of Sex and Prior Participation in the Project. 50

29. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score as a Function of Sex and Prior Participation in the Project. 51

30. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score as a Function of Sex and Prior Participation in the Project 51

31. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score as a Function of Sex and Prior Participation in the Project 51

32. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Total Raw Score as a Function of Sex and Prior Participation in the Project. 52

33. Mean C.A.T. Scores of First Graders as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project. 53

34. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project. 54

Table Page

35. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Total Raw Score as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project. 54

36. Mean C.A.T. Scores of Second Graders as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project 55

37. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project 56

38. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project 56

39. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: Second Grade Sample C.A.T. Total Raw Score as a Function of Participation in Nine Month Title I and Prior Participation in the Project. 56

40. Mean C.A.T. Scores of First Graders as a Function of Summer Title I Participation and Prior Participation in the Project 57

41. Summary of Significance of Analysis of Covariance: First Grade Sample C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score as a Function of Participation in Summer Title I and Prior Participation in the Project. 58

42. Families by County Scheduled for Initial Household Conditions Rating Survey and Number of Ratings Actually Conducted, January 31-February 7, 1968 63

43. Summary of Reasons for Exclusion of 25 Target Families from the Initial Household Conditions Rating Survey, January 31-February 7, 1968 63

44. Families by County Scheduled for Final Household Conditions Rating Survey and Number of Ratings Actually Conducted, June 17-June 21, 1968 64

45. Summary of Reasons for Exclusion of 11 Target Families from the Final Household Conditions Rating Survey, June 17-June 21, 1968 64

Table Page

46. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents Participating in the Household Conditions Rating Survey by County of Residence: February 1968 and June 1968. 65

47. Distribution of Families Surveyed Initially in February, 1968, by County and Service Received 68

48. Distribution of Families Surveyed for the Second Time in June, 1968 by County and Service Received 69

49. Mean Number of Social Worker, Case Aide and Homemaking Visits Received by Respondents in the four Household Conditions Rating Survey Classification Groups Prior to the February 1968 Survey and During the Interval Between the February 1968 and June 1968 Surveys. 74

50. Mean and Median Initial Ratings of Adequacy of Housing Conditions of Household Conditions Survey Respondents: February 1968 Survey 78

51. Mean and Median Second Ratings of Adequacy of Housing Conditions of Household Conditions Survey Respondents: June 1968 Survey 79

52. Summary of Sign Test Results: Significance of Change Shown by Household Conditions Rating Survey Respondents Between February 1968 and June 1968 in Adequacy of Housing Conditions 80

53. Mean Number of Persons Per Room Residing in Homes Visited During the February and June 1968 Household Conditions Rating Survey. 81

54. Mean and Median Initial Ratings of Adequacy of Foodstuffs Served by Household Conditions Survey Respondents: February 1968 Survey. 82

55. Mean and Median Second Ratings of Adequacy of Foodstuffs Served by Household Conditions Survey Respondents: June 1968 Survey. 83

56. Summary of Sign Test Results: Significance of Improvement Shown by Household Conditions Rating Survey Respondents Between February 1968 and June 1968 in Adequacy of Foodstuffs Served in the Home. 84

57. Median Number of Adults and Children Present in the Home During the February 1968 and June 1968 Household Conditions Rating Surveys 85

Table Page

58. Mean and Median Initial Sanitation and Safety Scores for Household Conditions Rating Survey Respondents: February 1968 Survey. 86

59. Mean and Median Second Sanitation and Safety Scores for Household Conditions Rating Survey Respondents: June 1968 Survey. 87

60. Summary of Nonparametric Test Results: Significance of Change Shown by Household Conditions Rating Survey Respondents Between February 1968 and June 1968 in Adequacy of Sanitation and Safety Conditions. 88

61. Frequency and Per Cent of Project Parents Included in Initial Child Rearing Attitudes Interview by County of Residence. 94

62. Frequency and Per Cent of Project Parents Interviewed Twice ("Total Group") on Child Rearing Attitudes by County of Residence. 96

63. Classification of Project Parents Interviewed Twice on Their Child Rearing Attitudes (Total Group) on the Basis of Their Children's Child Development Center (CDC) Attendance 97

64. Frequency and Percentage of Project Parents Initially Interviewed on the Education Scale by County of Residence. 105

65. Frequency and Percentage of Project Parents Interviewed Twice on the Education Scale by County of Residence. . . . 106

66. Community Survey Respondents Interviewed 113

67. Community Survey Respondents Used in Analysis. 113

68. Community Leader Sample Classified by Occupation (n=105) . 116

69. Average Number of Years of Education Completed by Resident Non-Professional Staff 121

70. Salaries of Non-Professional Staff (Current 1968). 122

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

A Title I Questionnaire

B Household Conditions Rating Scales

C Criteria for Household Conditions Ratings

D Household Conditions Rating Survey (Interview Form)

E Household Conditions Rating Survey: Demographic Data

F Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale

G Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale

H Original Item Pool Used in Constructions of The "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale"

I Original Item Pool Used in Construction of The "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale"

J Instructions For Judging Attitude Statements Concerning The Use of Fear to Control Children's Behavior (Morning and Afternoon Sessions)

K Instructions For Judging Attitude Statements Concerning Children's Rights and Liberties (Morning and Afternoon Sessions)

L The Education Scale

M Alternative Phrasings Used For Items on The Education Scale

N Community Survey Questionnaire

O Instructions For The Community Survey - Indigent Respondents

P Community Survey: Item Summary Comparing Community Leaders and Indigent Respondents

Q Job Specifications for Rural Child Care Project Program Staff (Professional and Non-Professional)

R The Employee Evaluation Form

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On August 30, 1968, the senior author of this report, Miss May Briscoe, left the project in order to complete her Ph.D. at the University of Florida. Because of several unavoidable delays in data collection and analysis, the final report of the 1967-1868 evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project was not completed at the time of Miss Briscoe's departure. Major responsibility for the final draft of this report was assumed by Dr. Judith Archambo when she took over Miss Briscoe's position as Research Director on September 1, 1968. Therefore, any errors in the reporting of methods and results, as well as any errors in conclusions reached in this report, are primarily the responsibility of Dr. Archambo.

Appreciation is expressed by Miss Briscoe and Dr. Archambo to the following persons who, as members of the Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation Research Division staff during 1967-1968, assisted in the collection and analyses of these data and in the writing of the quarterly and final reports: John L. Carter, Jr., Research Associate I; Mrs. Patricia Reinhart, Research Assistant IV; Mrs. Annette Braswell Stephenson, Research Assistant III; Mrs. Cloe Smith, Research Clerk III, and Miss Janis Graves, Research Clerk III. The authors wish to thank Mrs. Sheila Brooks, Principal Clerk Stenographer, Mrs. Barbara Smither, Senior Clerk Stenographer, and Miss Paula Moore, Senior Clerk Stenographer, for their invaluable assistance in the typing of the quarterly and final reports. The services of Mrs. Allie Hendricks, psychometric consultant, and Selwyn Zerof, computer programming consultant, were of great assistance in the completion of this project.

The entire staff of the Research Division is indebted to Jess L. Cusick, Program Director, and Edward E. Ellis, Project Director of the Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation, for the assistance they rendered in the planning and execution of the research evaluation reported herein. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. George Perkins, in his capacity as the Executive Director of the Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation for his support and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

The research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project during 1967-1968 had four major objectives. These were (1) to assess the relationship between a child's attendance in a Child Development Center and his subsequent intellectual performance and academic achievement; (2) to assess the effect of the combined casework, homemaking and day care services on families of children who have been exposed to the Child Development Program; (3) to ascertain the image of the Project in participating counties; and (4) to evaluate the effectiveness of the subprofessional staff in providing Project services to the culturally disadvantaged child and his family.

The effects of the Program were assessed by (1) obtaining follow-up I.Q. data on first and second graders who previously attended a Center and (2) comparing a sample of children who have attended a Child Development Center with the performance of a similar sample of untreated children on the basis of achievement. The effects of the Project on families served were evaluated by measuring changes in their patterns of household operation and changes in their attitudes toward education and toward various child-rearing practices. The image of the Project was assessed by ascertaining the degree to which the Project's existence and goals are known to a sample of community leaders and to an additional sample comprised of indigent adults, and ascertaining their attitudes toward the Project. The effectiveness of the subprofessional staff was evaluated by means of supervisors' ratings.

PROBLEM

One of the most pressing and complex social problems in today's society is cultural deprivation. One of the more serious aspects of this problem is that culturally disadvantaged children are ill-prepared to meet the demands made upon them in school. In the United States, cultural deprivation is most prevalent among such minority groups as Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and residents of Appalachia. (Crow, Murray and Smythe; 1966.)

The focus of the Rural Child Care Project is culturally disadvantaged children and their families in ten Appalachian counties of Eastern Kentucky. A basic assumption of the Project is that creative educational and social experiences during the pre-school years will enable culturally disadvantaged children to realize their potential for academic achievement.

The Rural Child Care Project has been ongoing since March, 1965.* To date two Child Development Centers with combined facilities for 60 children have been established in each of the following counties: Elliott, Floyd, Harlan, Knott, Lee, Letcher, Magoffin, Morgan, Owsley and Wolfe. A third, "outreach" center in Knott County offers services to 15 additional children in a highly isolated and disadvantaged community. Each Child Development Center provides a five-day-a-week, structured day care program from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. for children in the 3-6 year age range.

The program within each Child Development Center is designed to develop the child physically, socially, intellectually, and emotionally. The daily program incorporates activities to promote perceptual development and skills, speech and language development and cognitive learning. The program includes training in good health, safety and social habits. It also offers an opportunity for individual and group experiences, creative activities, and active and quiet play.

A second fundamental assumption of the Project is that improvement of the physical and sociocultural environment of disadvantaged families is requisite to the amelioration of cultural deprivation. Hence the program includes casework-homemaking services to the families of children enrolled in the Child Development Centers.

---

*This project was funded originally by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Grant Number Ky-CAP-66-437. For a detailed presentation of the program for 1967-1968 see the Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation, Inc. Rural Child Care Project Continuation Application for Grant Number Ky-CAP-66-437.

A third basic assumption is that indigenous, disadvantaged individuals can be trained to provide services such as those offered by the Project. Therefore, Caseworkers, Homemakers and the personnel employed at the Child Development Centers are native to the Appalachian Area and have not had the customary formal education which would qualify them for such positions. In order to overcome their lack of formal education the Project includes a training component.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following review of literature relevant to the research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project, the focus is on: (1) follow-up studies of the effects of preschool programs upon subsequent intellectual functioning and school achievement, (2) follow-up studies of the effects of preschool programs upon family patterns and parental attitudes, (3) findings concerning community attitudes toward preschool programs for culturally deprived children.

The findings concerning the effect of preschool participation on subsequent intellectual functioning of culturally disadvantaged children reported in the literature have varied. Some investigators (Brazziel, 1967; Cawley, 1968; Eisenberg, Undated Report; Hyman and Sill, 1965 Office of Economic Opportunity Head Start Office, 1966; Office of Economic Opportunity Public Affairs Office, 1966; Osborn, 1967; Pierce-Jones, 1968; Rieber and Womack, 1968; Smith, 1968) have reported findings which indicated that children who participated in preschool programs made significant gains on tests of mental ability and attributes related to subsequent educational success. Deutsch (1965) reported significant results coming from his enrichment programs for culturally deprived pre-kindergarten children. Tests at the end of the program showed the experimental group to be significantly superior to the control group. A year later, with a second group of children, significant results were again obtained. Wilkerson (1965) reported two studies in which disadvantaged children made large increases on standardized measures of intellectual functioning after pre-kindergarten participation. Gray and Klaus found that after three years of public school, their experimental groups were consistently superior on two tests of intelligence. A study by Coleman, et al, (1966) compared a nationwide sample of 4,007 children, stratified by race, who had attended Head Start during the summer of 1965 prior to their entrance to first grade with a control group of 1,711 non-participant first graders in the same schools as well as with a second control group of 5,614 non-participant first graders in communities where Head Start was not available. In general, the investigators found that upon entrance to first grade, former Head Start participants of a given race scored lower on tests of verbal and of nonverbal reasoning than did non-participants. However, there is reason to believe that the Head Start participants would have scored considerably lower on such tests than the control subjects even before the Head Start experience. Unfortunately no data are presented to either substantiate or reject this hypothesis. Alpern (1966) found no significant difference between experimental and control children after a seven-month cultural enrichment program. The author's opinion was that the intelligence of the children was unaffected by participation in nursery school. However, the number of children involved in this study was quite small. Krider and Petsche (1968) worked with three groups of disadvantaged children; one Head Start group matched with one non-Head Start group and a third group made up of non-matched Head Start participants. Results of testing showed no significant difference between matched groups on increase of intellectual ability and achievement level. The non-matched non-Head Start group did significantly better on these variables than did the non-matched Head Start group. All groups showed highly significant gains on the variables on the basis of within-group comparisons. Holmes and Holmes (1968) started three Head Start programs to evaluate the differences in four groups of children in terms of intelligence, cognition, achievement, environment and parental expectations. The four groups were: (1) the group in which the parents of the children sought entry for their children in the Head Start program, (2) the group in which children were recruited by the project personnel, (3) the group in which the children were also recruited by the project personnel but did not choose to participate, and (4) a group of middle-class non-participating children, on the average a year younger than children in the other three groups. All children were tested at the time the project started and groups one and two were tested again at the end of the six-month program. Results showed that the middle-class group scored consistently highest, and group one was generally second highest. The home environments of groups one and four seemed more likely to provide motivation for effective learning than groups two and three. The parents of groups one and four seemed more encouraging toward and interested in their child's development.

In summary, the investigations which to date have attempted to assess both the short-term and long-run effects of participation in preschool programs do not point to any consistent conclusions, at least as far as I.Q. gains are concerned. Indeed, because the majority of those investigations which have reported significant gains in I.Q. following participation in preschool programs are of a preliminary nature and, in addition, because of the failure of demonstrated gains to persist during follow-up for most investigators, the question has been raised (Kraft, 1966) as to whether those gains which have been detected might in fact have been due to factors other than the preschool experience _per se_ (e.g., developmental processes). Zigler and Butterfield (1968) found that the increase in I.Q. which results from the preschool experience was due to "a reduction in the effects of debilitating motivational factors rather than to changes in rate of intellectual development." (p. 1.)

Instead of focusing program evaluation solely on gains in intellectual performance, some investigators have also studied the effects of preschool on the participant's subsequent adjustment to public school. Siedel, Barkley and Stith (1967) found significant gains on a before-after measure of motivation and adjustment to the school situation over an eight-week period for a sample of 115 participants in summer Head Start programs in North Carolina. Coleman _et al_ (1966) observed differences between Head Start participants and non-participants in educational interest and motivation as measured by teacher ratings of children at entrance to first grade. The motivation would not be translated into skills which could be reflected in other performance scores until the children had been exposed to school for several years. Hodes (1968) after testing Head Start and non-Head Start (disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged) participants suggested that participation in

Head Start is related to increases in conceptual maturity but not to the degree that the influence of poverty is overcome. Bereiter (1966) is even more critical, stating that the traditional nursery school approach adopted by most Head Start programs is designed to accomplish small gains in a number of school skills whereas the disadvantaged child primarily needs intensive instruction in language functioning.

Some investigators have attempted to assess the persistence of gains in intellectual functioning of children with preschool experience as they advance in elementary school. Wolff and Stein (1967) found no significant difference in actual learning achievement between 168 former Head Start participants and a control group of 383 non-participants after six months in public school kindergartens. Chorost _et al_ (1968) found no significant gains by Head Start participants over non-participants on repeated measures of aptitude and achievement after subjects had completed one full year of formal school and again after six months of their second year of school. Blatt and Garfunkel, (1967) evaluated a two-year preschool program for sixty disadvantaged children after a one-year follow-up period. The analyses of data on repeated measures of cognitive, noncognitive, and "environmental" factors lead the investigators to conclude that there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups at the end of first grade. Steglich and Cartwright (1967) evaluated Head Start participants and non-participants on subsequent school grades, teacher evaluations, and standardized test scores at the completion of first grade and again at the completion of second grade of public school. They found no significant differences between the experimental and control groups. An analysis of the data on the basis of sex suggested a greater gain for boys than girls from Head Start participation at the end of first grade, however, the lead of Head Start boys over Head Start girls became smaller by the end of second grade. The authors noted that when girls showed an advantage, it was due to a socio-economic variable such as higher occupational status of the father. DiLorenzo (1968) in testing young disadvantaged children after one year of preschool training found that only his white male experimental group showed an increase in mean I.Q. while the other groups experienced a loss. This group produced the only significant difference when compared with its control group. However, Smith's (1968) results showed that after a year of preschool, girls with preschool experience were significantly superior to all other groups on the Stanford-Binet and PPVT with no significant differences between the male experimental group and the male and female control groups. Kagan (1964) cities studies which show that from kindergarten through fourth grade, "the girls typically outperform the boys in all areas". Schwertfeger and Weikart (1967) found that the initial Stanford-Binet I.Q. gains which had been made by children who had participated in a one-year preschool program at Ypsilanti, Michigan had disappeared by the time the children had finished kindergarten. Moreover, there was no evidence of any re-establishment of I.Q. gains when the children were tested again at the end of the first and at the end of the second grades. However, the investigators did find a significant difference between the preschool participants and their non-participant controls on the California Achievement Tests which favored the preschool group. These tests were administered at the completion of the second grade as well as at the completion of the first grade. In a follow-up study of a preschool program in Tennessee, Gray and Klaus (1968) found after administering two different achievement tests at the end of both the first and second grades that at the end of the second grade there was no significant difference in test performance between the experimental and control groups. This finding is not consistent with the finding mentioned earlier in which the experimental groups were superior to the control groups on two tests of intelligence.

These follow-up studies of the persistence of gains in intellectual functioning and achievement leads one to suspect that there are important variables operating which have not been measured or controlled in the studies reported in the literature. Blatt and Garfunkel (1967) found a relatively high correlation between a measure of family adequacy and average school performance of siblings, from which they inferred that school failure was family-linked and thus should be treated through the family. In a study of eighty fourth graders in Trinidad, Dyer (1965) found that the "educational environment" of the home was more closely related than intelligence or other social background variables to school achievement.

The causes of failure of culturally deprived children (especially those with Head Start experience) when they enter school and the effects of this failure on these children has been discussed by several investigators. Teachers of culturally deprived children have generally learned not to expect very much from their students. Rosenthal (1968) has shown that teachers with low expectations for their pupils can cause the pupils to conform to that expectation in behavior and performance. Hickerson (1966) criticizes the use of culturally-based I.Q. tests since it has been shown that economically deprived children do poorly on these tests and are therefore classified at an early age as slow or dull and treated accordingly. Deutsch (1965) states that culturally disadvantaged children begin school so totally unprepared to accomplish what is demanded of them that early failures are to be expected. This early failure negatively rather than positively reinforces the school experience. Metfessel (1966) reports "The culturally disadvantaged child is often characterized by significant gaps in knowledge and learning. Entering school from a background which has not prepared him for success in a traditional curriculum, the pupil participated in communication procedures and patterns alien to him...Born into a community in which relatively few adults have been successful in school, the disadvantaged child hardly can be expected to be self-motivated in his work in the classroom....The cycle of skill mastery which demands that successful experiences generate more motivation to learn which in turn generates levels of skill sufficient to prevent discouragement, and so on, may be easily reversed in direction and end the learning habit prior to its beginning." (pps. 48-49). Bloom, Davis and Hess (1965) report "The emphasis in the first three years of elementary school should be on the development of each child. In these years, the child should not be failed or expected to repeat a grade or year. The careful sequential development of each child must be one of continual success at small tasks." (p. 25.) Finally Miller (1967) indicates "The most immediate explanation for the widely observed regression of Head Start children when they enter kindergarten is that the average school does not provide a learning climate necessary to retain the gains of preschool experience, which is characterized by smaller classes, specially trained teachers, supportive non-professional personnel and the involvement of parents." (pps. 141-142.) From this it can be concluded that if the culturally deprived child with preschool experience does not maintain certain gains in public school it is because the learning environment in public school, unlike the preschool, is not designed to meet the special needs of culturally deprived children.

Having grade schools provide better programs to consolidate and increase preschool learning is a function of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I was designed to "encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families...the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate. These special programs include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children...." (1965) The effects of Title I projects in educational programs dealing with disadvantaged children are still unclear and inconclusive. However, some programs have been very effective when used with Title I projects. The Educational Improvement Program in Philadelphia tried to increase reading and arithmetic achievement and to culturally enrich elementary grade disadvantaged children. Important factors in the program included an effort to improve the quality of instruction, and to reduce all first grade classes to 30 students. Comparisons based on the evaluation of 10,000 children showed that children in this program consistently scored higher at significant levels than children not in the program. After three years of this program, the cumulative effects of EIP have resulted in continuing superiority of EIP groups over non-EIP groups. This program suggests that reading and arithmetic skills can be improved through smaller classes and individualized instruction. (Rosica, 1968) In Los Angeles a nine-month Title I program for deprived pre-kindergarten children provided experiences, motivation and guidance to prepare them for formal schooling. The program tried to support gains made by the children by working directly and intensively with the parents. The number of pupils in each classroom was limited to 15 with one teacher and one teacher-aide per class. The results from pre and post administration of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and a school readiness test showed a significant improvement in the children. Teacher ratings showed increases in speaking and listening skills, also in social and emotional development. Parental, pupil, teacher, and community attitudes were quite favorable to the program. Because this study did not include a control group, it is not clear if these children were better prepared for formal schooling than if they had not experienced such a program. The authors argue that a program incorporating small class size, teacher-aides, and participating parents does provide better preparation for formal school experience. (Estes, 1968) Such studies as the aforementioned suggest the prediction that public schools with strong Title I programs will provide a more favorable learning environment for building upon gains made during preschool training.

The influence of housing on child development was studied by Rice (1968) and the relative influence compared with Head Start and non-Head Start children. Four groups of children were used, each group containing 52 five-year-old Negro children. The groups were: (1) Head Start participants, living in public housing; (2) Head Start participants, living in slum housing; (3) non-Head Start participants, living in public housing; (4) non-Head Start participants, living in slum housing. Mother interviews and the Preschool Inventory (a post-test) were the means of evaluation. It was hypothesized that Head Start children from better housing would surpass the other groups in growth and development. Further hypotheses were that non-Head Start children from slum housing would show the least growth and development and that groups two and three would show the relative importance of housing versus an enrichment program in facilitating development. The hypotheses were supported, but because there was no pre-testing, the results are somewhat suspect. However, results of this study do suggest that the more severe the environmental deprivation the more difficult it is to affect change in the child's subsequent development, both intellectual and social. This type of assumption has been responsible for a strong emphasis in Head Start on involving the family as well as the child. To date no studies have related the severity of the child's deprivation at home to effects of child development programs and related social services to his development in terms of improving family living patterns.

Some investigators have referred to the secondary effects of the preschool experience on the child's parents. From ancedotal evidence, Osborn (1967) suggests that as a function of the child's Head Start experience, attitude changes can be expected from teachers and parents, particularly concerning the role of the parent in the educational process. To discover what effects certain social forces had on Head Start participants, Chandler (1968) interviewed several Head Start families and several non-Head Start families to determine attitudes toward these variables and to learn their expectations for Head Start participation by their children. Biographical and observational data was also recorded for these families. The conclusion of the study was that Head Start did not reach the more severely culturally deprived children. Recommendations as a result of the attitude survey were made suggesting: that more indigenous persons be used in anti-poverty programs, that Head Start families be compensated for participation and that present programs be evaluated realistically. In another study (Clarizio, 1968), 72 culturally deprived mothers were randomly assigned to one of three groups to determine attitude changes as result of participation in Head Start. There were two experimental groups consisting of mothers with children in an eight-week summer Head Start project and a control group. The treatments given the experimental groups were similar although group two received more "family-focused" contact from the program. There were four objectives held in common for both experimental groups: to change parental attitudes toward school personnel, school policy, readiness activities of educational value, and pupil-teacher relations. It was hypothesized that after participation in the program experimental group two would have the most favorable attitudes toward education and the school and the control group would have the least favorable attitudes of the three groups. A second hypothesis stated that experimental group two would participate most in school affairs and the control group would participate the least. These hypotheses were not confirmed. This suggests that the home-school aspect of Head Start programs has not altered the educational attitudes of lower class mothers. However, Weikart (1964) in his program has found that teachers can establish meaningful relationships with culturally deprived mothers. These relationships have resulted in the involvement of these mothers in their children's educational programs and in a shifting of their child-rearing attitudes toward a middle-class position. The key factor in the apparent success of this program in changing parental involvement attitude is unclear.

There are few studies reported which attempt to assess the effects of Head Start on the community. Johnson and Palomares (1968) interviewed a total of 256 parents of children of preschool age to determine if there were significant differences in responses to questions about certain ecological, economic, social and civic responsibility factors between parents of Head Start children and those parents whose children were eligible, but did not attend Head Start. No significant differences in responses were found. The principle distinction between the Head Start and non-Head Start parents was a matter of information. Participants were informed of the Head Start program; non-participants were not. This illustrates the need for effective communication with low-income families in order that the existing education programs for their children may be utilized. To date little research has been done to discover the extent to which the general community is aware of these programs, despite the fact that many programs depend on the approval and endorsement of community leaders and on the willingness of indigents to become involved.

HYPOTHESES

The 1967-1968 research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project had four major objectives. These were: (1) to assess the relationship between a child's attendance in a Child Development Center and his subsequent intellectual performance and academic achievement; (2) to assess the effect of the combined casework, homemaking and day care services on families of children who have been exposed to the Child Development Program; (3) to ascertain the image of the Project in participating counties; and (4) to evaluate the effectiveness of the subprofessional staff in providing Project services to the culturally disadvantaged child and his family.

The following hypotheses concerning the effects on the child of exposure to the Child Development Program were derived, for the most part, from the preceding review of the literature. The first three hypotheses relate to the Program's effect on the child's subsequent intellectual performance and academic achievement:

> Hypothesis 1: Children who have previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days and who were tested once on the Stanford-Binet when they enrolled in a Center and again when they were in first grade will show a loss in their performance on the Stanford-Binet by the time they have had two years of formal schooling. This loss will be relative both to their initial performance on the Stanford-Binet and to their performance at the time of the second administration of the test.
>
> Hypothesis 2: First graders who previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days will do better on a standardized achievement test than will first graders who have not attended a Child Development Center. However, the performance of both groups of children on the test will be substandard in comparison to norms.
>
> Hypothesis 3: Children who previously have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days and who will enter the second grade in September, 1967 will do no better on a standardized achievement test than will a comparable group of children who have not attended a Center. In addition, the performance of both groups of children will be substandard in comparison to the norms.

The following three hypotheses concern the effect of the Project on the families of children enrolled in the Child Development Centers.

Hypothesis 4: Project families who have received casework/homemaking services for a minimal period of six months will show a significant improvement in their pattens of household operation.

Hypothesis 5: Parents of children who have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days will change in their attitudes toward various child-rearing practices. Specifically, these parents will become less punitive, more supportive and more consistent in their attidues toward children.

Hypothesis 6: Parents of children who have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days will show a change in their attitudes toward education. Specifically, these parents will become more favorable in their attitudes toward the value of a high school education.

Since the success of the Project is to some extent dependent upon its image in target communities, one of the research objectives was to assess the community's knowledge of and attitudes toward the Project. Specifically, the investigators attempted to answer the following questions: "To what extent are individuals in the target communities aware of the existence of the Project? To what degree are they cognizant of the goals of the program? And, of those who are cognizant of the goals, to what extent do they think the Project is achieving them?"

The fourth and final research objective was to evaluate the effectiveness of the subprofessional staff* in providing casework, homemaking and day care services to Project families.

---

*Persons who are indigenous to the Appalachian area and who have not had the formal education and experience which would qualify them as professionals.

I. Intellectual Functioning of Former Rural Child Care Project Participants: Follow-up Comparisons of Stanford-Binet I.Q. Scores

Hypothesis 1 states that,

> "Children who have previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days and who were tested once on the Stanford-Binet when they enrolled in a Center and again when they were in first grade will show a loss in their performance on the Stanford-Binet by the time they have had two years of formal schooling. This loss will be relative both to their initial performance on the Stanford-Binet and to their performance at the time of the second administration of the test."

METHOD

Subjects

During the latter half of the 1967-1968 school year (February, March and April) 41 children who had been formerly enrolled in the Project's Child Development Program, who had been tested for the first time on the Stanford-Binet during the 1965-1966 Project fiscal year while attending one of the Centers, and who had been tested on the Binet for the second time during the winter of 1967 while in the latter half of first grade, were tested a third time on the Binet.*

The I.Q. data of two of the 41 children tested during 1968 were deemed invalid by the psychological examiner,** and hence these children were eliminated from the Hypothesis 1 sample. A third child was eliminated when it was discovered that he failed to meet the Child Development Center attendance criterion of sixty days specified in Hypothesis 1. The remaining 38 children constitute the sample used for evaluating Hypothesis 1.

Although it had been anticipated that almost all of the children in the Hypothesis 1 sample would be enrolled in Grade 2 during the 1967-1968 school year, 12 of the 38 were again enrolled in Grade 1 during 1968 for the second consecutive year.* These 12 children will henceforth be referred to as the "Grade 1 Repeater Group". The remaining 26 children who were tested were enrolled in Grade 2 as anticipated and will be referred to as the "Grade 2 Group".

---

*Prior to the 1968 Binet administration permission to test each child was secured from his parents.

**One child was so withdrawn and mute that his test performance was not considered to be an adequate reflection of his capabilities. The testing of the other child had to be terminated prior to its completion.

Table 1 presents a breakdown of each group on the basis of 1967-1968 school district of enrollment and county of residence. From this it may be seen that all but two of the 12 Grade 1 Repeater Group were enrolled in schools in Knott, Magoffin, and Wolfe Counties at the time of the third administration of the Binet, whereas the 26 members of the Grade 2 group were more evenly distributed among the seven school districts in which testing was conducted. Although all of the members of both groups were Caucasian, the Grade 1 Repeater Group was predominately male (n=9 or 75%) while the Grade 2 Group was more evenly divided among the sexes (12 males versus 14 females). Finally, the two groups were roughly comparable in terms of the chronological ages (C.A.) of the members at the time of the 1968 testing (mean C.A.=92.5 months, SD=4.03, range=87-99; mean C.A.=93.38 months, SD=4.81, range=87-110; for the First Grade Repeater and Second Grade Groups respectively).

Materials

The 1960 L-M form of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale was used in the test administration.

Procedure

The testing site for the 1968 administration of the Stanford-Binet consisted of a room or a corner of a room located within the child's school of enrollment or, if no room was available in the school, the nearest Project Child Development Center was used as a testing site. In all cases the testing was conducted by Mrs. Allie Hendricks, who is fully certified by the state of Kentucky to administer psychological tests and who has served since 1965 as a Stanford-Binet administrator for the Rural Child Care Project.** With each child tested, Mrs. Hendricks followed the standard procedures for administration and scoring of the Binet.

---

*Each of these 12 children had been enrolled for the first time in Grade 1 during the 1966-1967 school year. At the end of that year, they were retained in Grade 1 for an additional year. According to the observation of the Research staff, the rate of non-promotion at the end of first grade is as high as 25% in some Project counties. The Kentucky State Department of Pupil Personnel Services reports that for the three counties in which former Project participants in the present sample were retained (Knott, Magoffin, and Wolfe) the retention rates for first grade ranged from 15.6% to 23.3% in 1967-1968.

**Several different test administrators participated in both the 1965-1966 and the 1966-1967 testing.

TABLE 1: FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN THE GRADE 1 REPEATER AND GRADE 2 GROUPS BY 1967-1968 SCHOOL DISTRICT OF ENROLLMENT AND COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

1967-1968 School District of Enrollment And County Of Residence	1967-1968 Grade 1 Repeater Group		1967-1968 Grade 2 Group	
	f	Per Cent	f	Per Cent
Elliott	0	0.0%	2	7.7%
Knott	4	33.3	5	19.2
Lee	1	8.3	4	15.4
Magoffin	3	25.0	7	26.9
Morgan	0	0.0	1	3.8
Owsley	1	8.3	3	11.5
Wolfe	3	25.0	4	15.4
TOTAL	12	99.9%	26	99.9%

RESULTS

I.Q. Change for the Total Sample of Former Project Children

In order to test Hypothesis 1, changes in Binet I.Q. scores obtained on the first, second and third testings of the 38 former Project children comprising the sample were compared by means of one-tailed Critical Ratio tests. The major dependent variables in all comparisons are difference scores, that is, third I.Q. minus first I.Q., second I.Q. minus first I.Q., and third I.Q. minus second I.Q. The chosen level of significance for all analyses is $\rho < .05$.

Table 2 presents the mean, standard deviation and range of I.Q. scores on first, second and third testings (1966-1968) for the sample:

TABLE 2: MEAN STANFORD-BINET I.Q. SCORES OF FORMER RURAL CHILD CARE PROJECT PARTICIPANTS (N=38) OBTAINED WHILE ENROLLED IN THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER PROGRAM (1966) AND IN FIRST (1967) AND SECOND (1968) GRADES (INCLUDING GRADE 1 REPEATERS)

	First Binet (1966)	Second Binet (1967)	Third Binet (1968)
Mean	88.39	89.34	86.24
σ	14.37	15.28	15.30
Range	62-131	57-123	52-127
Mean Chronological Age In Months	66.27	80.14	92.94

Difference scores depicting the degree of I.Q. change occurring between each of the three testings are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3: DIFFERENCE SCORES DEPICTING I.Q. CHANGE FOR FORMER PROJECT PARTICIPANTS[†] (N=38)

	3rd Binet I.Q.- 1st Binet I.Q.	2nd Binet I.Q.- 1st Binet I.Q.	3rd Binet I.Q.- 2nd Binet I.Q.*
Mean Difference Score	-2.16	+0.95	-3.42
Standard Deviation	10.28	11.38	6.89
Range of Difference Scores	-31 to +15	-28 to +25	-16 to +9

[†] First I.Q. administered while enrolled in a Child Development Center; Second I.Q. administered during first grade; and Third I.Q. administered during second grade or while repeating first grade).

*Critical Ratio =3.05, $\rho < .01$, one-tailed test.

Critical Ratio tests indicate that change in I.Q. scores is significant only between the second and third tests. That is, the sample as a whole decreased an average of 3.42 I.Q. points from the second to third testing. I.Q. change from first to second and first to third testing is not significant. This finding indicates that former Project participants maintained their I.Q. level from the time they were tested while enrolled in a Child Development Center through the end of first grade. However, from first to second grade, mean I.Q. dropped significantly from 89.34 to 86.24.

The above results provide partial support for Hypothesis 1; that is, children who previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimum of sixty days do show a loss in their performance on the Stanford-Binet by the time they have had two years of formal schooling. However, this loss is relative only to their second test when performance on their third test is the basis of compariso

The predicted I.Q. change is not reflected in a comparison of I.Q. scores obtained on the first and second administrations of the Binet o when third and first test scores are compared.

The Relationship Between Initial I.Q. Level, Grade Placement Status and I.Q. Change in Former Project Children

Because it was found that a number (n=12) of former Child Development Center children in the present sample had not been promoted at the end of first grade, it was decided to compare on a post hoc basis the Grade 1 Repeater Group with the Grade 2 Group (n=26) in terms of I.Q. change. It was predicted that being retained at the end of the first year of public school is related to I.Q. change. Nonpromotion signifies the child has "failed" first grade - and this failure experience may be related to decreases in I.Q. scores.

Table 4 presents the mean I.Q. scores obtained by the Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 Groups on the first, second and third administrations of the Binet. Two sample t-tests comparing the group means for each Binet testing indicate that the two groups differ significantly on the second and third administrations but not the first. In all cases the differences in mean I.Q. scores favor the Grade 2 Group.

It was noted further that half of the Grade 1 Repeater Group (n=6) had scored below 80 on their initial I.Q. test, whereas the rest of the group had initially scored between 80 and 114. This observation suggested that retention or failure at the first grade level would have been predicted (on the basis of I.Q. scores alone) for only half of the group if it is assumed that an I.Q. score below 80 indicates subnormal, borderline functioning, and an I.Q. above 80 indicates a low average or better level of intellectual ability. In support of this argument, it was also determined by inspection that only four of the 26 Grade 2 Group (i.e., those promoted on schedule) had initially scored below 80 on the Binet.

TABLE 4: MEAN STANFORD-BINET I.Q. AND MEAN CHRONOLOGICAL AGE AT FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD TESTING OF THE 1967-1968 "FIRST GRADE REPEATER" AND "SECOND GRADE" GROUPS

		Grade 1 Repeaters (n=12)	Grade 2 (n=26)
Stanford-Binet I.Q. Score	Mean=	82.33	91.19
At First Administration	σ =	13.84	13.72
(August 1965-May 1966)	Range=	62-114	64-131
Chronological Age In Months	Mean=	65.00	67.54
At First Administration	σ =	4.58	7.48
	Range=	59-77	56-88
Stanford-Binet I.Q. Score	Mean=	79.75*	93.77*
At Second Administration	σ =	10.45	15.10
(January and February 1967)	Range=	57-94	66-123
Chronological Age In Months	Mean=	79.08	80.19
At Second Administration	σ =	4.01	4.66
	Range=	73-85	73-96
Stanford-Binet I.Q. Score	Mean=	75.50**	91.19**
At Third Administration	σ =	11.48	14.30
(February and March 1968)	Range=	52-99	67-127
Chronological Age In Months	Mean=	92.50	93.38
At Third Administration	σ =	4.03	4.81
	Range=	87-99	87-110

---

*Two sample t = 3.21, $\rho < .001$, two-tailed test.

**Two sample t = 4.49, $\rho < .0001$, two-tailed test.

To ascertain the effects of grade placement status and initial I.Q. level upon change in I.Q. scores, three two-way analyses of covariance were performed. The comparison groups were constituted in the following manner. Grade 1 Repeaters (n=12) were grouped according to initial I.Q. level: a) Above 80 on initial Binet (n=6) and b) At or below 80 on initial Binet (n=6). Grade 2 subjects (n=26) were divided correspondingly into groups of initial I.Q. scores above 80 (n=22) and at or below 80 (n=4). An analysis of covariance design was employed to control for variability due to a) Binet I.Q. #2, b) chronological age at first and second Binet administrations, and c) prior, interim and total Child Development Center attendance. Table 5 presents a comparison between Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 groups categorized on the basis of initial I.Q. (Above 80 versus 80 or Below) on the above covariates:

TABLE 5: COMPARISON BETWEEN GRADE 1 REPEATER AND GRADE 2 GROUPS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO INITIAL STANFORD-BINET I.Q. (ABOVE 80 VERSUS 80 OR BELOW) ON SIX COVARIATES.

	Grade 1 Repeater Above 80 Initial I.Q.	Grade 1 Repeater 80 or Below Initial I.Q.	Grade 2 Above 80 Initial I.Q.	Grade 2 80 or Below Initial I.Q.
N	6	6	22	4
Mean C.A. in Mos. at Binet I.Q. #1	64.7	65.3	65.6	78.0
Mean CDC Attendance (in days) Prior to Binet I.Q. #1	13.2	46.0	40.7	102.5
Mean CDC Attendance (in days) Between Binet I.Q. #1 and #2	89.8	84.8	89.6	15.2
Mean Binet I.Q. #2	81.8	77.7	97.0	75.8
Mean C.A. in Mos. at Binet I.Q. #2	77.5	80.7	79.0	86.8
Mean Total CDC Attendance (in days)	103.0	130.8	130.3	117.8

Table 6 presents the mean I.Q. change scores between first, second and third Binet tests for the four comparison groups.

TABLE 6: MEAN STANFORD-BINET I.Q. CHANGE AS A FUNCTION OF GRADE PLACEMENT STATUS DURING 1967-1968 AND INITIAL STANFORD-BINET I.Q.

CONDITION	N	MEASURE		
		3rd Binet I.Q. - 1st Binet I.Q.	2nd Binet* I.Q. - 1st Binet I.Q.	3rd Binet I.Q. - 2nd Binet I.Q.
Grade 1 Repeater - Initial Binet I.Q.= Above 80	6	-14.17	-11.67	-2.50
Grade 1 Repeater - Initial Binet I.Q.= 80 or Below	6	+0.50	+6.50	-6.00
Grade 2 - Initial Binet I.Q.= Above 80	22	-0.46	+2.36	-2.82
Grade 2 - Initial Binet I.Q.= 80 or Below	4	+2.50	+3.75	-1.25

*Grade Placement Status x Initial Stanford-Binet I.Q. interaction is significant, $F_{1,31}=4.96$, $\rho<.05$.

Results for two analyses of covariance for which third Binet I.Q. minus first Binet I.Q. and third Binet I.Q. minus second Binet I.Q. were the dependent variables indicate no main effects or interactions significant at the .05 level.

The other analysis, for which second Binet I.Q. minus first Binet I.Q. was the dependent variable, employed as covariates the following variables in order to control for their effects: 1) chronological age at first Binet administration, 2) Child Development Center attendance prior to first Binet administration, and 3) Child Development Center attendance during the interim between first and second Binet administrations. As Table 7 indicates, there is a significant interaction between grade placement status and initial I.Q. ($F_{1,31}=4.96$, $\rho<.05$).

The number of subjects in each of the four cells involved in the interaction varies from 4 to 22, which precludes performing a meaningful sequential comparison of cell means. By inspection of the data (see Table 6), it appears this significant interaction is due mainly to the mean I.Q. loss of 11.7 points shown by the Grade 1 Repeaters who scored above 80 on their initial I.Q. test. All of the other three groups show slight to moderate average gains in I.Q. during the same time period.

TABLE 7: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: I.Q. CHANGE BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE STANFORD-BINET INTELLIGENCE SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GRADE PLACEMENT STATUS DURING 1967-1968 AND INITIAL STANFORD-BINET I.Q.

Source*	df	F	P
Grade Placement Status (GPS)	1/31	0.16	NS
Initial Stanford-Binet I.Q. (I)	1/31	1.79	NS
GPS x I	1/31	4.96	.05

---

*Adjusted for the effects of chronological age at initial Stanford-Binet administration; Child Development Center attendance occurring prior to initial administration; and Child Development Center attendance occurring after the initial administration.

The above analysis indicates that of those former Project children who were not promoted at the end of first grade, the more "intelligent" (according to initial Binet scores) decreased in I.Q. significantly during first grade (i.e., during the interim between their first and second Binet tests). The fact that the six Grade 1 Repeaters at or below 80 on their initial Binet test did not show a similar loss in I.Q. points during first grade suggests that retention *per se* is not causally related to I.Q. change in the present sample. It could be argued, on the basis of the present findings, that the large and significant decrease in I.Q. scores from first to second Binet administrations for retained subjects who scored above 80 initially is merely a manifestation of regression to the mean. That is, those Grade 1 Repeater subjects who scored above 80 initially may have scored spuriously high, which would have resulted in a significant drop in I.Q. at the time of the second Binet administration. If this argument is valid, then those cases where regression to the mean would have been predicted to operate maximally would be in the initially above 80 - Grade 1 Repeater group, i.e., among those subjects whose initial I.Q. scores were high enough to predict success in first grade but who subsequently failed to be promoted and showed a significant loss in I.Q. scores. According to the same argument, regression to the mean would not be predicted to operate maximally in those cases where initial I.Q. predictions were accurate (i.e., Grade 1 Retained, initially at or below 80 and Grade 2, initially above 80) with respect to grade placement status in the 1967-1968 school year. In both of these groups, I.Q. change from first to second Binet administrations due to regression alone would not be predicted to be significant. Accordingly, it would also be expected that subjects most likely to show an increase in I.Q. scores due to regression would be those in the Grade 2, initial I.Q. below 80 group. Unfortunately, due to the small number of subjects in this latter group, a test of these predictions is not possible.

Assuming that regression phenomenon does not account entirely for the significant interaction between grade placement status and initial level of I.Q. for I.Q. change scores between first and second administrations of the Binet, this analysis indicates that a corollary for Hypothesis 1 is needed: that is, children who previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimum of sixty days will show a gain or loss in I.Q. scores after they enter grade school as a function of grade placement status and initial I.Q. (assuming that the affects of regression are controlled). Those predicted to gain the most in I.Q. are children who scored above 80 initially on the Binet and who are promoted on schedule. Those predicted to show the greatest decrements in I.Q. are children who obtained initial Binet I.Q. scores above 80 but who are not promoted on schedule.

The Relationship Between Grade Placement Status, Attendance at a Child Development Center, and I.Q. Change in Former Project Participants

Examination of the Child Development Center (CDC) attendance records of the Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 groups indicates that they vary widely in terms of the number of days they were present in a Child Development Center prior to the administration of their first Stanford-Binet and the number of days they attended a Center during the interim between their first and second Binet tests (see Table 8). It was determined by inspection that 25 of the Grade 2 and 11 of the Grade 1 Repeaters* could be categorized as follows in terms of their CDC attendance: a) those who attended more than 10 days before the administration of their first Binet and less than 100 days in the interim between the administrations of their first and second Binet tests, and b) those who attended less than 10 days prior to their first Binet and more than 100 days during the interim between first and second administrations of the Binet.

---

*One child in each group was eliminated from this analysis since they could not be classified according to a) and b) above.

TABLE 8: SUMMARY OF 1965-1966 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (CDC) ATTENDANCE INFORMATION ON THE 1967-1968 "FIRST GRADE REPEATER" AND "SECOND GRADE" GROUPS†

		1967-1968 Grade 1 Repeaters (n=12)	1967-1968 Grade 2 (n=26)
CDC Attendance In Days Occurring Prior To The First Administration Of The Stanford-Binet	Mean=	29.6	50.2
	σ =	46.1	55.4
	Range=	0-131	0-149
CDC Attendance In Days Occurring After First Administration Of The Stanford-Binet	Mean=	87.3	78.2
	σ =	50.9	62.6
	Range=	5-167	4-198
Total CDC Attendance In Days	Mean=	116.9	128.4
	σ =	31.8	31.3
	Range=	65-169	69-198

---

†All of the children in the 1967-1968 "First Grade Repeater" and "Second Grade" groups were still enrolled in the Project's Child Development Program and all were still attending one of the Project's Child Development Centers at the time of the first administration of the Stanford-Binet. At the time of the second administration, all of these children were enrolled for the first time in Grade 1 of a public school located within one of the Project counties.

An analysis of covariance design was again employed to control for variance due to differences between comparison groups in 1) first and second Binet I.Q., and 2) chronological age at first and second Binet administrations. Table 9 presents a comparison of the Grade 1 Repeater and Grade 2 groups, classified according to prior and interim CDC attendance, in terms of the above covariates:

TABLE 9: COMPARISON BETWEEN GRADE 1 REPEATER AND GRADE 2 GROUPS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO PRIOR AND INTERIM CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER ATTENDANCE ON FOUR COVARIATES

	Grade 1 Repeater, More Than 10 Days Prior, Less Than 100 Days Interim CDC Attendance	Grade 1 Repeater, Less Than 10 Days Prior, More Than 100 Days Interim CDC Attendance	Grade 2, More Than 10 Days Prior, Less Than 100 Days Interim CDC Attendance	Grade 2, Less Than 10 Days Prior, More Than 100 Days Interim CDC Attendance
N	5	6	15	10
Mean Binet I.Q. #1	88.0	75.8	88.9	95.5
C.A. in Mos. at Binet I.Q. #1	66.6	64.0	72.8	59.7
Mean Binet I.Q. #2	83.6	74.2	91.9	97.3
C.A. in Mos. at Binet I.Q. #2	78.2	80.8	82.4	76.5

Table 10 presents mean I.Q. change scores for the four comparison groups.

Three two-way analyses of covariance were performed incorporating two levels of CDC attendance status, and Binet I.Q. change scores as the dependent variables. The first analysis, summarized in Table 11, indicates that there is a significant main effect associated with grade placement status ($F_{1,30}=5.07$, $\rho<.05$) when I.Q. change from first to third administrations of the Binet is the basis of comparison. Inspection of the cell means in Table 10 shows that when first and third Binet I.Q. scores are compared, Grade 1 Repeaters lost an average of 6.64 I.Q. points, whereas Grade 2 children lost, on the average, less than 1 I.Q. point (-.22) during the same period. No other effects were significant.

In the remaining two analyses, which compared change between Binet I.Q. #1 and #2 and Binet I.Q. #2 and #3 respectively, no significant main effects or interactions were found.

TABLE 10: MEAN STANFORD-BINET I.Q. CHANGE AS A FUNCTION OF GRADE PLACEMENT STATUS DURING 1967-1968 AND PREVIOUS ATTENDANCE AT A CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (CDC)

CONDITION	N	MEASURE		
		3rd Binet I.Q. - 1st Binet I.Q.	2nd Binet I.Q. - 1st Binet I.Q.	3rd Binet I.Q. - 2nd Binet I.Q.
Grade 1 Repeater-Attended A CDC More Than 10 Days Before And Less Than 100 Days After Binet #1	5	-7.60	-4.40	-3.20
Grade 1 Repeater-Attended A CDC Less Than 10 Days Before And More Than 100 Days After Binet #1	6	-5.67	-1.67	-4.00
Grade 2-Attended A CDC More Than 10 Days Before And Less Than 100 Days After Binet #1	15	-0.13	+3.07	-3.20
Grade 2-Attended A CDC Less Than 10 Days Before And More Than 100 Days After Binet #1	10	-0.30	+1.80	-2.10

TABLE 11: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: I.Q. CHANGE BETWEEN THE FIRST AND THIRD ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE STANFORD-BINET INTELLIGENCE SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GRADE PLACEMENT STATUS DURING 1967-1968 AND PREVIOUS ATTENDANCE AT A CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER*

Source	df	F	P
Grade Placement Status (G)	1/30	5.07	.05
Previous CDC Attendance (A)	1/30	0.00	NS
G x A	1/30	0.17	NS

---

*Adjusted for the effects of Stanford-Binet I.Q. at first administration and chronological age at first administration.

On the basis of these analyses, it is clear that previous attendance in a Child Development Center is not significantly related to I.Q. change in the present sample. The finding that grade placement status is significantly related to I.Q. change lends support to the finding, reported in the preceding section, of a significant interaction between grade placement status and initial I.Q. level, in which Grade 1 Repeaters who scored above 80 on their first Binet lost I.Q. points whereas the three other groups all showed some gains in I.Q. However, this significant interaction occurred only when I.Q. change from first to second Binet tests was compared. Unlike the present finding, no significant differences were found between initial I.Q. level and grade placement status comparison groups when change from first to third Binet tests was analyzed.

Looking at the results for the two analyses involving grade placement status, i.e., grade placement status x initial I.Q. level (reported in the preceding section) and grade placement status x previous CDC attendance, it can be concluded that the significant finding that children who were retained at the end of first grade decreased in I.Q. scores from first to third Binet administrations can best be explained by noting the significant interaction between grade placement status and initial I.Q.; that is, among children retained at the first grade level, the greatest loss in I.Q. occurred between the first and second administrations of the Binet for those children who had scored above 80 initially.

It should be noted that performance of a three-way analysis of covariance incorporating grade placement status, initial I.Q. level, and previous CDC attendance was precluded by the unequal and unduly small numbers of subjects available for the eight comparison groups comprising such an analysis (in one case, Grade 2 - initially 80 or below - less than 10 prior and more than 100 interim CDC attendance, no subjects were available).

It may be that the present analysis, which classified subjects only in terms of their prior and interim CDC attendance, masked the effect of total CDC attendance upon I.Q. change. During the 1968-1969 I.Q. testing of this sample of former Project participants, analyses of I.Q. change related to the fourth Binet test should also take into account the relationship between I.Q. scores obtained during grades 1-3 and total CDC attendance.

A Comparison of Matched Pairs of Grade 2 and Grade 1 Repeater Children Who Scored Above 80 on Their Initial Stanford-Binet Test

On the basis of the finding that decrease in I.Q. scores appears greatest for those former Project participants whose initial I.Q. scores were above 80 and who were retained in first grade at the end of 1967, it was decided to compare I.Q. change scores (between first, second and third administrations of the Stanford-Binet) of the six Grade 1 Repeaters whose initial I.Q. scores were above 80 with six former Project children in the Grade 2 Group matched to them on the following variables: 1) Initial I.Q. score (within plus or minus 5 I.Q. points); 2) Chronological age at first Stanford-Binet administration (within plus or minus 5 months); 3) Child Development Center attendance prior to initial Stanford-Binet administration (within plus or minus 20 days); and 4) Total Child Development Center attendance (plus or minus 47 days). Table 12 compares the two groups in terms of the matching variables. It was not possible to match subjects on the basis of sex or county of residence. Matching on the above four variables yielded a sample of six pairs containing three boys and three girls in the Grade 2 Group and five boys and one girl in the Grade 1 Repeater Group. Four subjects in each group are from Knott County; the remaining two subjects are from Magoffin County (Grade 2 Group) and Owsley and Wolfe Counties (Grade 1 Repeater Group).

TABLE 12: COMPARISON OF THE GRADE 1 REPEATER AND GRADE 2 - ABOVE 80 INITIAL I.Q. - MATCHED SUBGROUPS ON MATCHING VARIABLES

MATCHING VARIABLE	STATISTIC	SUBGROUP	
		Grade 1 Repeater (n=6)	Grade 2 (n=6)
Stanford-Binet I.Q. Score At First Administration	Mean	93.50	93.17
	σ	9.67	10.89
	Range	84-114	84-117
Chronological Age In Months At First Administration	Mean	64.67	65.67
	σ	2.91	3.80
	Range	62-71	59-70
CDC Attendance In Days Occurring Prior To First Administration	Mean	13.17	16.67
	σ	11.12	3.80
	Range	2-30	59-70
Total CDC Attendance In Days	Mean	103.00	112.33
	σ	35.96	21.79
	Range	65-169	84-138

Table 13 presents Binet I.Q. scores and chronological age at first, second and third administrations for the six Grade 2 and Grade 1 Repeater matched pairs. (It should be recalled that these pairs were matched in terms of initial I.Q. scores and C.A. at initial I.Q. testing.)

The data in Table 13 indicate that although the Grade 2 and Grade 1 Repeater Groups were initially matched in I.Q. and, accordingly, did not differ significantly from each other in initial I.Q., they diverge significantly by the third administration of the Binet ($p<.05$). Bearing in mind the previously expressed reservations regarding these data* it is noteworthy that the Grade 1 Repeaters whose initial Binet I.Q. was above 80 show a consistent decrease in I.Q. scores from first to third administrations of the Binet, whereas their Grade 2 matches maintain their initial I.Q. level from first to third tests, with a small increase occurring between first and second tests followed by a small decrease between second and third tests.

---

*i.e., the possibility that those Project children who scored above 80 on their initial Binet and subsequently repeated first grade may have scored spuriously high on their initial Binet, which would have contributed significantly, through statistical regression, to their subsequent significant loss in I.Q. between first and second Binet tests.

TABLE 13: STANFORD-BINET I.Q. SCORES AND CHRONOLOGICAL AGE AT TESTING (IN MONTHS) FOR MATCHED PAIRS OF GRADE 2 AND GRADE 1 REPEATERS WHOSE INITIAL I.Q. SCORES WERE ABOVE 80

	Mean I.Q.	σ	Range	Mean C.A.	σ	Range
			FIRST ADMINISTRATION (1966)			
Grade 2	93.17	10.89	84-117	65.67	3.80	59-70
Grade 1 Repeaters	93.50	9.67	84-114	64.67	2.91	62-71
			SECOND ADMINISTRATION (1967)			
Grade 2	100.17	15.77	84-111	78.67	2.42	75-81
Grade 1 Repeaters	81.83	13.50	57-94	77.50	4.32	73-82
			THIRD ADMINISTRATION (1968)			
Grade 2	95.83*	12.34	76-104	91.67	2.42	88-94
Grade 1 Repeaters	79.33*	11.74	66-99	91.17	4.36	87-96

*t-test for matched samples= 2.92, df= 5, $\rho < .05$ (two-tailed test).

This pattern of I.Q. change is also apparent when I.Q. difference scores for the two matched groups are compared (see Table 14). Within-group comparisons of I.Q. change by means of t-tests for correlated data indicate that the Grade 1 Repeater, Initial I.Q. Above 80 Group decreased significantly from first to third administration of the Binet ($\rho < .05$). Between-groups comparisons utilizing t-tests for matched groups indicate that mean I.Q. change scores for the two groups differed significantly when I.Q. changes between first and second Binet tests and first and third Binet tests are the basis of comparison ($\rho <$ .05 and .01, respectively). Inspection of Table 14 suggests that these significant differences are due mainly to the large decrease in I.Q. scores occurring between the first and second Binet tests (during first grade) for the Grade 1 Repeater - Initial I.Q. Above 80 - Group. These data also support the observation already stated concerning the different pattern of I.Q. change for the Grade 2 and Grade 1 Repeaters; that is, the Grade 2 Group essentially has maintained its initial I.Q. status whereas the Grade 1 Repeater Group has declined steadily - especially during the first year of formal schooling.

TABLE 14: MEAN STANFORD-BINET I.Q. CHANGE FOR GRADE 1 REPEATER AND GRADE 2 MATCHED SUBGROUPS*

SUBGROUP	MEASURE		
	3rd Binet I.Q. - 1st Binet I.Q.	2nd Binet I.Q. - 1st Binet I.Q.	3rd Binet I.Q. - 2nd Binet I.Q.
Grade 1 Repeater-Above 80 Initial Binet I.Q. (n=6)	-14.17†**	-11.67***	-2.50
Grade 2-Above 80 Initial Binet I.Q. (n=6)	+2.67**	+7.00***	-4.33

*These subgroups were matched on the following four variables: initial Binet I.Q. score; CDC attendance prior to initial Binet administration; chronological age at initial Binet administration; and total CDC attendance.

†t for correlated scores= 3.14, df= 5, $\rho < .05$ (Grade 1 Repeater group, only). (two-tailed test)

**t for matched samples= 4.34, df= 5, $\rho < .01$. (two-tailed test)

***t for matched samples= 2.63, df= 5, $\rho < .05$. (two-tailed test)

The results of the matched pairs comparisons support the conclusion stated in the preceding sections dealing with overall analyses of I.Q. change and analyses of the effects of grade placement status, initial I.Q. level, and previous CDC attendance: as a group, former Project participants show a significant decrease in Stanford-Binet I.Q. scores after two years of formal schooling. This decrease, however, is consistent and significant for those children who obtained a Binet I.Q. score above 80 when they were originally tested in a Child Development Center and who were not promoted at the end of first grade.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the discussion of the results pertaining to Hypothesis 1, it has already been stated that a continuing evaluation of I.Q. change in former Project participants is planned for the 1968-1969 fiscal year. Specifically, the 1968-1969 Research Proposal (OEO-4205) contains two hypotheses based upon findings of the 1967-1968 research evaluation (page 7):

Hypothesis 1 states that,

> "Children who previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty (60) days and who were tested on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale for the first time while enrolled in a Center and for the second and third times respectively while enrolled in the first and second grades will show a gain in their performance on the Stanford-Binet by the time they have had three years of formal schooling. This gain will be relative both to their performance at the time of the second and to their performance at the time of the third administrations of the test."

Hypothesis 2 states that,

> "Children who previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty (60) days and who will enter third grade on schedule in September, 1968 will show a significantly greater gain in their performance on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale than will a comparable group of former Project children who will be one grade-placement below the norm in September, 1968, either because they were retained in the first or in the second grade. This gain will be most pronounced among children whose Stanford-Binet I.Q. initially was above 80."

The underlying rationale of these hypotheses is explained as follows (1968-1969 Research Proposal, page 9):

> "The purpose in testing Hypothesis 1 is to determine the existence of changes in intellectual functioning subsequent to a child's participation in the Child Development Program that become evident only after the passage of some period of time. One might speculate, for example, that during his first and even to some extent during his second year in

> school, the disadvantaged child's intellectual performance is adversely affected by the demands placed upon him to adjust to his new social and physical environment (i.e., the classroom milieu). This presumably would be reflected in a deterioration of his performance on an I.Q. test or in a failure to show predicted gains. By the time he has had almost three years of formal schooling, however, the child probably will have had sufficient opportunity and time to stabilize his adjustment to the school environment; consequently, he should be less distractible and more motivated to perform well on such tasks as taking I.Q. tests."
>
> "Underlying Hypothesis 2 is the assumption that the effect of participation in the Child Development Program on a child's subsequent intellectual functioning is a function of the degree of success or failure he has experienced in school. Thus the child who participates in the Child Development Program and who then experiences some degree of success in the primary grades may show a greater gain or, conversely, less deterioration in intellectual functioning than a comparable child who, after participating in the Program, experiences failure in the primary grades. Moreover, there is some reason to believe that this effect might be more pronounced in children whose I.Q.'s initially were above 80. Presumably such children would be more apt to expect success in school and consequently would be more disturbed by failure than children whose initial level of intellectual functioning is much below average (i.e., below 80)."

Another recommendation for the 1968-1969 continuing evaluation of I.Q. change is that some attempt be made to determine the reasons for which former Project children were retained by their first (or second) grade teachers. Until it can be determined what factors other than initial I.Q. level distinguish the children who were retained, the process(es) underlying significant I.Q. loss in former Project children cannot be specified. To obtain information for determining the process(es) underlying the significant interaction between grade placement status and initial I.Q. level, the child's case history (while the family was active in the Project), as well as his first (or second) grade experience will be investigated.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that since the majority of children in the Grade 1 Repeater group (n=12) are boys (n=9) and 5 of the 6 Grade 1 Repeaters whose initial I.Q. was above 80, were boys, sex of the child _per se_ may be a determining factor underlying grade placement status and initial I.Q. level interaction in the present sample. An attempt to determine to what extent the sex of the child is related to I.Q. change and grade placement status should be made in the 1968-1969 research evaluation by including parents of retained children in the sample of parents to be interviewed concerning their achievement orientation and achievement aspirations for their children (see pp. 18-23, Hypothesis 6 of the 1968-1969 Research Proposal).

II. Achievement Functioning of Former Rural Child Care Project Participants: Follow-up Comparisons of California Achievement Test Scores

Hypothesis 2 states that,

> "First graders who previously attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days will do better on a standardized achievement test than will first graders who have not attended a Child Development Center. However, the performance of both groups of children on the test will be substandard in comparison to norms."

Hypothesis 3 states that,

> "Children who previously have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days and who will enter the second grade in September, 1967 will do no better on a standardized achievement test than will a comparable group of children who have not attended a Center. In addition, the performance of both groups of children will be substandard in comparison to the norms."

METHOD

The general method for evaluating Hypotheses 2 and 3 was to administer the California Achievement Test (C.A.T.), Lower Primary Level, to samples of former Project participants and children selected as control groups enrolled in first and second grades at the time of testing in March, 1968. Total Battery scores and Reading, Language and Arithmetic scores were utilized to compare the performances of former Project children with their controls.

Subjects

Lists of possible subjects for achievement testing were drawn up in mid-1967. These were children who had withdrawn from a Child Development Center during the spring or summer of 1966 or 1967 to attend a Head Start program or to enter public school. Information regarding the grade placement of these 510 children and the schools in which they were enrolled at that time was obtained. Forty-four children were immediately eliminated, 32 having moved from the county or state and 12 not being enrolled in school. All of the 466 children remaining were enrolled in first or second grade in a Project county elementary school. The total attendance at a Child Development Center was then obtained for each child and it was determined that 62 children had not attended sixty days, the minimal attendance requirement. This requirement was met by the remaining 404 children who made up the potential sample. In each county, the school having the most former Rural Child Care Project children enrolled was selected as the testing site.

In early 1968, school officials in eight Project counties* were contacted and permission was secured to test in the pre-selected schools. The names of the first and second grade experimental subjects were sent to their respective schools along with the request that a control group be selected that corresponded to the experimental group with respect to race, sex, age, socioeconomic status and grade placement. Also, it was asked that any child who had attended a Child Development Center for any length of time be excluded from this control group.

In the first grade sample, 89 experimental subjects and 90 control subjects were tested. In the second grade sample, there were 64 experimental subjects and 62 control subjects for a total of 305 children tested.

After the achievement testing in March of 1968, a further attempt was made to obtain matched pairs of experimental-control children on a post hoc basis within grades and schools on the basis of grade placement, socioeconomic status, sex, race and age. Exact grade placement information, children's date of birth and socioeconomic status were secured from teachers and principals while testing was in progress. Race and sex matching was accomplished from the examiners' notes.

Students who had been retained in Grade 1 (i.e., were not promoted to second grade) were eliminated from the sample as were controls whose birthdays did not fall within plus or minus five months of their experimental match's birthday.** To be matched it was also necessary for the experimental and control pair to be within the same economic grouping, i.e., poor matched with poor, average matched with average.

Children were eliminated from the sample for several reasons other than inability to match them on the above variables. There were three students who did not complete the test. The tests of three students were misplaced. A main reason control children were eliminated was the discovery that 21 first graders and 15 second graders designated as control subjects had actually attended the Rural Child Care Project Child Development Centers at least one day but less than sixty or had received Project social services. In all 104 subjects were not used. This information is summarized in Table 15.

---

*No achievement testing was done in Harlan and Letcher Counties because there were not enough former Rural Child Care Project children in any one school.

**This attempt to match pairs on the basis of chronological age was not successful in a large number of cases. Hence, it was decided to control for any variability in chronological age at testing by incorporating this variable as a covariate in an analysis of covariance design.

TABLE 15: REASONS SUBJECTS WERE EXCLUDED FROM C.A.T. SAMPLE (n=104)

Reason Excluded	First Grade Experimental	Control	Second Grade Experimental	Control
No match available	33	8	17	1
Misclassified*	0	21	0	15
Did not complete test	1	2	0	0
First grade retained	2	1	0	0
Test misplaced	0	1	2	0
Total by Grade Placement Status	36	33	19	16

---

*Subjects either attended a Child Development Center at least one day but less than sixty or had received Project social services.

This left a total of 201 subjects in the sample. Table 16 presents the breakdown of this sample by county, school, grade and treatment.

TABLE 16: CHILDREN USED IN THE C.A.T. ANALYSES BY COUNTY, SCHOOL, GRADE AND TREATMENT (n=201)

County	School	First Grade Experimental	Control	Second Grade Experimental	Control
Elliott	Sandy Hook	(15)* 10	(15) 10	(16) 7	(14) 7
Floyd	McDowell	(8) 7	(8) 7	Not Tested	
Knott	Jones Fork	(13) 9	(13) 9	(11) 7	(11) 7
Lee	Southside	(10) 7	(10) 7	(4) 2	(4) 2
Magoffin	John T. Arnett	(11) 6	(11) 6	(7) 7	(7) 7
Morgan	Ezel	(11) 8	(11) 8	(6) 4	(6) 4
Owsley	Booneville	(16) 6	(17) 6	(12) 10	(12) 9
Wolfe	Red River	(5) 3	(5) 3	(8) 8	(8) 8
TOTALS		(89) 56	(90) 56	(64) 45	(62) 44

---

*Numbers in parentheses represent the numbers of children actually tested (n=305).

Materials

The Lower Primary form (Grades 1 and 2) of the California Achievement Tests (1957 edition, 1963 norms) was used to assess school achievement. This series of tests was designed for the multiple purpose of "Facilitating evaluation, educational measurement and diagnosis".* These tests were so constructed that individuals with minimal training in testing procedures may use them. The manuals provided complete instructions for administering, scoring, and interpreting the tests.

The California Achievement Test is divided into three subject areas: Reading, Arithmetic and Language. The Reading test consists of a section which measures reading vocabulary and one which measures reading comprehension. The Arithmetic test measures arithmetic reasoning and mastery of arithmetic fundamentals. The Language test consists of three sections - capitalization, punctuation and word usage.

The directions and questions for all but the Reading test and the Arithmetic Fundamentals test are read to the subjects in order that slow or poor readers will not be penalized on tests which do not specifically measure reading ability.

The California Achievement Test is scored by counting the number of correct responses for each section of each test. Then the subtotals of each test are added to arrive at a total score for each of the three areas (Reading, Arithmetic and Language). The area scores are then combined to give the total battery score.

The dependent variables for all C.A.T. analyses consisted of the child's Total Battery score and his subject area scores in Reading, Arithmetic and Language.

Procedure

The testing was accomplished in March, 1968 by two teams of testers, each team consisting of two members of the research staff. The same team member in almost every instance administered the test and when possible helped the other team member proctor the test. Children were tested in groups ranging from 6 to 15. In all cases, an attempt was made to have each group tested composed of equal numbers of experimental and control group subjects.

Numerous problems were encountered during the testing. The anticipated testing time of 2 or 2½ hours was usually exceeded. This was due to a number of reasons: requests from the school that the subjects adhere to the regular classroom schedule for homeroom, recess, lunch, etc.; in one school testing was carried out in the lunchroom-gymnasium and testing had to stop during all lunch periods because of the noise; some children could not comprehend even the simplest instructions, e.g., "Turn the page"; some children did not know how to use a pencil; and occasional discipline problems arose, of which the most frequent was copying from another child's test booklet.

---

*Tiegs, E. W. and Clark, W. W. California Achievement Tests Complete Battery Manual, Lower Primary, Grades 1 and 2, Forms W and X, 1957 Edition, California Test Bureau, McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1963.

Achievement Test Performance of First and Second Graders as a Function of Participation in ESEA Title I Programs

The Title I program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has as its purpose: "to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, ... to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low income families" (1965). As part of the 1967-1968 research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project, it was proposed to determine whether participation in the Child Development Center Program followed by enrollment in a public school having a strong Title I program would lead to greater gains in achievement than either the Child Development Center experience or attendance at a strong Title I school alone.

Local and State Title I officials were contacted in order to obtain information regarding Title I programs in the eight target counties where follow-up achievement testing of former Project participants and their matched controls had been done. No information other than the dollar amount appropriated for each component of the Title I program per school district and the total number of eligible participants in grades one through three was available. No figures on the amount of Title I funds spent per child in grades one and two according to type of program or individual school district were available.

Therefore, to arrive at a rough estimate of the strength of Title I programs for each of the eight target school districts, a questionnaire was devised (see Appendix A) with the assistance of the office of the Title I Coordinator of the Kentucky State Department of Education. This questionnaire, which was sent to the eight target county school superintendents during June and July, 1968, requested information concerning the amount of Title I funds spent for grades one and two in the school district during the 1967-1968 school year and the nature of the services purchased by these funds, e.g., teacher services, equipment or materials purchased.

On the basis of information received in the questionnaire, the six target county school districts* receiving Title I funds in grades one and two during the regular 1967-1968 school year were rated on several program aspects. (See Table 17) In terms of the total amount of curriculum funds spent the districts were rated from highest to lowest as follows: Floyd, Owsley, Wolfe, Lee, Morgan, Magoffin. With respect to the total amount of funds for special equipment used in the teaching of mathematics, language arts and special education, the rankings from highest to lowest were as follows: Floyd, Owsley, Wolfe, Magoffin. (Lee and Morgan Counties received no funds in this category.) On the basis of total funds for textbooks used for teaching mathematics, language arts and special education, the ratings from highest to lowest were as follows: Floyd, Lee, Wolfe, Magoffin. (Owsley and Morgan Counties received no funds in this category.)

---

*Of the eight counties included in the Title I survey, Elliott County received no Title I funds for grades one and two. For grades one and two Knott County received Title I funds for a summer program only.

Only Lee and Owsley Counties received Title I funds to employ certified teachers (either full or part-time) to instruct first and second grade students in mathematics, language arts or special education during the 1967-1968 regular school year. For this reason it was not feasible to rate the counties on this dimension.

Floyd County was considered (based on the above ratings) to have the "best" Title I program of the eight counties where achievement testing was conducted with first grade pupils. Owsley County was rated as the "best" Title I program among the seven counties where testing was conducted with pupils in the second grade (no second graders were tested in Floyd County).

On the basis of these ratings of Title I program strength it was possible to compare the achievement test performance of first and second grade former Project participants and their matched controls in those counties rated as having the "best" nine month Title I program (Floyd County-first grade, and Owsley County, second grade) with subjects tested in the one county having no Title I program (Elliott County). Additional comparisons of C.A.T. scores of experimental and control first grade children were also possible between a full nine month Title I program (Floyd County) and a summer only Title I program (Knott County) and between a summer only Title I program (Knott County) and no Title I program (Elliott County).

TABLE 17: SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED ON THE TITLE I QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO COUNTY TITLE I COORDINATORS, JUNE-JULY, 1968: SERVICES AND EQUIPMENT SUPPORTED BY TITLE I FUNDS IN GRADES ONE AND TWO, 1967-1968

County	Total Curriculum Development Funds	N Full-Time Certified Teachers In Math, Reading, Special Education, Etc.	N Part-Time Certified Teachers In Math, Reading, Special Education, Etc.	N Full-Time Teacher Aides	N Part-Time Teacher Aides	Total Funds - Special Equipment In Math, Reading, Special Education, Etc.	Total Funds - Books In Math, Reading, Special Education, Etc.
Floyd*	$51,200	0	0	5	13	$5,700**	$2,000**
Owsley*	12,900	0	11	4	0	1,000	0
Wolfe*	8,257	0	0	0	3	750	350
Lee*	5,318	1	4	0	4	0	1,925
Morgan*	2,328	0	0	0	0	0	0
Magoffin	1,800	0	0	0	15	100	150
Elliott†	None	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knott††	None	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Library Program funded by Title I.

**Science Program: $5,000 for special equipment, $1,000 for books.

†No Title I Program.

††Summer Title I Program only.

RESULTS

The Effect of Prior Participation in the Rural Child Care Project

In order to evaluate Hypothesis 2, the California Achievement Test scores of the first grade experimental (former Project participants) and control (non-Project participants) groups were compared by means of an analysis of covariance design.* For all analyses treatment (experimental versus control) and county (the eight target counties: Elliott, Floyd, Knott, Lee, Magoffin, Morgan, Owsley and Wolfe) were the independent variables. Separate analyses were performed for each of the dependent variables: Arithmetic, Language and Reading area subtests and Total Battery C.A.T. scores. For all analyses the proportions of subjects in the experimental and control groups according to sex and socioeconomic (SES) designation (i.e., a rating of "average" or "below average" assigned by the child's current classroom teacher) were the same. Due to the small and unequal numbers of subjects within each of the eight counties it was not possible to have subjects distributed in the same proportions according to sex and socioeconomic designation within each county.

There were no main effects or interactions that attained the .05 level of significance. Thus, it can be concluded that first grade children who participated in the Rural Child Care Project do not differ significantly in terms of their achievement test scores from similarly disadvantaged children who did not participate in the Project. Hypothesis 2 is therefore not supported by these findings.

The evaluation of Hypothesis 3, i.e., that second grade former Project participants would do no better on the C.A.T. than second grade nonparticipants, was accomplished by using the same analyses of covariance design described above in the evaluation of Hypothesis 2. There were no significant main effects or interactions associated with treatment or county for any of the four C.A.T. scores serving as dependent variables for the analyses. According to these results, Hypothesis 3 is supported. Prior participation in the Rural Child Care Project is not significantly related to scores obtained on the C.A.T. for the sample of second graders included in this study.

Comparison of First and Second Graders to C.A.T. Norms

It was also predicted in Hypotheses 2 and 3 that "the performance of both groups of children** will be substandard in comparison to norms".

---

*The single covariate for all analyses was chronological age at testing since it proved impossible to match pairs on this variable. In general, control group subjects tended to be older than their experimental group matches.

**Experimental (former Project participants) and control (nonparticipants).

In order to evaluate this aspect of Hypotheses 2 and 3, the C.A.T. scores of first and second graders who were used in the analyses reported in the previous section, were converted to grade placement equivalent scores, according to the 1963 norms given in the C.A.T. manual. For all first graders, their actual grade placement was 1.6 and for all second graders, their actual grade placement was 2.6, i.e., all subjects were administered the C.A.T. during the latter half of the school year, after six months of school had elapsed. Thus for a first grader, a grade placement equivalent score of 1.6 would indicate he was performing on the C.A.T. at a level equal to the average achievement of pupils who are 83-84 months of age and whose median I.Q. is 100. In a similar manner a grade placement equivalent score of 2.6 attained by a second grader indicates he is performing at a level on the C.A.T. comparable to the average achievement of pupils 96 months of age with a median I.Q. of 100.

Table 18 indicates the average chronological ages for first and second grade experimental and control group subjects within each county. These comparisons indicate that the total mean chronological ages for first and second grade control group children are appropriate for actual grade placements of 1.6 and 2.6. The total mean chronological ages for first and second grade experimental group children are younger than their actual grade placement scores would predict. That is, first grade experimental subjects have an average C.A. of 81.36 months rather than 83-84 months and second grade experimental subjects have an average C.A. of 92.55 months rather than the expected 96 months. Therefore on the basis of chronological age, the expected grade placement status for the experimental group should be closer to 1.4 for first graders and 2.3 for second graders rather than 1.6 and 2.6.

Tables 19 through 22 present the mean grade placement equivalent scores of first and second grade experimental and control groups computed on the basis of their raw scores obtained on the Total C.A.T. Battery and on the Reading, Arithmetic and Language area subtests.

TABLE 18: MEAN CHRONOLOGICAL AGE AT C.A.T. TESTING FOR SUBJECTS CLASSIFIED BY COUNTY, SCHOOL, GRADE PLACEMENT AND TREATMENT

		First Grade		Second Grade	
County	School	Experimental	Control	Experimental	Control
Elliott	Sandy Hook	81.70(10)*	83.30(10)	94.42 (7)	99.14 (7)
Floyd	McDowell	80.43 (7)	87.71 (7)	not tested	
Knott	Jones Fork	81.78 (9)	84.67 (9)	92.14 (7)	95.00 (7)
Lee	Southside	85.00 (7)	85.43 (7)	91.00 (2)	90.00 (2)
Magoffin	John T. Arnett	80.00 (6)	81.00 (6)	92.00 (7)	94.42 (7)
Morgan	Ezel	80.12 (8)	80.25 (8)	92.00 (4)	94.75 (4)
Owsley	Booneville	79.67 (6)	81.00 (6)	92.90(10)	98.89 (9)
Wolfe	Red River	82.00 (3)	80.67 (3)	92.00 (8)	95.00 (8)
Total Mean C.A. based upon weighted means=		81.36(56)	83.27(56)	92.55(45)	96.11(44)

---

*n

TABLE 19: MEAN GRADE PLACEMENT EQUIVALENT SCORES (TOTAL BATTERY) FOR SUBJECTS TESTED ON THE C.A.T. CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO COUNTY, SCHOOL, GRADE PLACEMENT AND TREATMENT GROUP

		First Grade		Second Grade	
County	School	Experimental (1.4)†	Control (1.6)†	Experimental (2.3)†	Control (2.6)†
Elliott	Sandy Hook	1.40(10)*	1.45(10)	2.44 (7)	2.31 (7)
Floyd	McDowell	1.14 (7)	1.06 (7)	not tested	
Knott	Jones Fork	1.31 (9)	1.29 (9)	2.10 (7)	1.94 (7)
Lee	Southside	1.29 (7)	1.36 (7)	2.40 (2)	1.75 (2)
Magoffin	John T. Arnett	1.12 (6)	1.32 (6)	2.11 (7)	2.24 (7)
Morgan	Ezel	1.05 (8)	1.15 (8)	2.45 (4)	2.65 (4)
Owsley	Booneville	1.18 (6)	1.13 (6)	1.71(10)	1.52 (9)
Wolfe	Red River	1.20 (3)	1.13 (3)	2.06 (8)	1.99 (8)
Total Mean (weighted)=		1.22(56)	1.26(56)	2.11(45)	2.03(44)

---

†Actual grade placement corrected for group mean chronological age.

*n

TABLE 20: MEAN GRADE PLACEMENT EQUIVALENT SCORES (READING) FOR SUBJECTS TESTED ON THE C.A.T. CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO COUNTY, SCHOOL, GRADE PLACEMENT AND TREATMENT GROUP

		First Grade		Second Grade	
County	School	Experimental (1.4)	Control (1.6)	Experimental (2.3)	Control (2.6)
Elliott	Sandy Hook	1.32(10)*	1.40(10)	2.61 (7)	2.39 (7)
Floyd	McDowell	1.04 (7)	1.01 (7)	not tested	
Knott	Jones Fork	1.33 (9)	1.46 (9)	2.10 (7)	2.07 (7)
Lee	Southside	1.18 (7)	1.23 (7)	2.40 (2)	1.45 (2)
Magoffin	John T. Arnett	1.15 (6)	1.23 (6)	2.10 (7)	2.33 (7)
Morgan	Ezel	1.09 (8)	1.20 (8)	2.30 (4)	2.38 (4)
Owsley	Booneville	1.12 (6)	1.02 (6)	1.68(10)	1.40 (9)
Wolfe	Red River	1.10 (2)**	1.07 (3)	2.03 (8)	1.99 (8)
Total Mean (weighted)=		1.19(55)	1.23(56)	2.10(45)	2.01(44)

---

*n

**Data unavailable for one subject.

TABLE 21: MEAN GRADE PLACEMENT EQUIVALENT SCORES (ARITHMETIC) FOR SUBJECTS TESTED ON THE C.A.T. CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO COUNTY, SCHOOL, GRADE PLACEMENT AND TREATMENT GROUP

		First Grade		Second Grade	
County	School	Experimental (1.4)	Control (1.6)	Experimental (2.3)	Control (2.6)
Elliott	Sandy Hook	1.48(10)*	1.51(10)	2.63 (7)	2.54 (7)
Floyd	McDowell	1.17 (7)	1.07 (7)	not tested	
Knott	Jones Fork	1.42 (9)	1.42 (9)	2.27 (7)	1.94 (7)
Lee	Southside	1.34 (7)	1.44 (7)	2.35 (2)	2.05 (2)
Magoffin	John T. Arnett	0.98 (6)	1.43 (6)	2.00 (7)	2.31 (7)
Morgan	Ezel	1.10 (8)	1.25 (8)	2.50 (4)	2.82 (4)
Owsley	Booneville	1.18 (6)	1.17 (6)	1.82(10)	1.58 (9)
Wolfe	Red River	1.23 (3)	1.23 (3)	2.26 (8)	2.10 (8)
Total Mean (weighted)=		1.26(56)	1.33(56)	2.21(45)	2.13(44)

---

*n

TABLE 22: MEAN GRADE PLACEMENT EQUIVALENT SCORES (LANGUAGE) FOR SUBJECTS TESTED ON THE C.A.T. CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO COUNTY, SCHOOL, GRADE PLACEMENT AND TREATMENT GROUP

		First Grade		Second Grade	
County	School	Experimental (1.4)	Control (1.6)	Experimental (2.3)	Control (2.6)
Elliott	Sandy Hook	1.31(10)*	1.46(10)	2.26 (7)	2.16 (7)
Floyd	McDowell	1.23 (7)	1.12 (6)	not tested	
Knott	Jones Fork	1.37 (9)	1.29 (9)	1.98 (7)	1.81 (7)
Lee	Southside	1.33 (7)	1.33 (7)	2.40 (2)	1.75 (2)
Magoffin	John T. Arnett	1.20 (6)	1.38 (6)	2.24 (7)	2.41 (7)
Morgan	Ezel	0.85 (8)	1.21 (8)	2.45 (4)	2.72 (4)
Owsley	Booneville	1.22 (6)	1.18 (6)	1.67(10)	1.67 (9)
Wolfe	Red River	1.07 (3)	0.97 (3)	2.00 (8)	1.98 (8)
Total Mean (weighted)=		1.21(56)	1.28(56)	2.06(45)	2.04(44)

---

*n

With respect to grade placement equivalents based upon Total Battery C.A.T. scores (see Table 19), it is evident that experimental and control groups in the first and second grades are functioning as a whole from two to four months below their actual grade placement. Inspection of group means for each of the eight target schools indicates that in some cases the children tested equal or exceed (by no more than 1½ months) their actual grade placement (experimental group, first and second grades, Elliott county; and both experimental and control groups, second grade only, Morgan county).

Grade placement equivalents based upon Reading achievement scores (Table 20) indicate that the total groups of experimental and control children in both first and second grades are from two to six months below the achievement level of their actual grade placement. Only in two cases (experimental groups, second grade, Elliott and Lee counties) did children equal or exceed their actual grade placement level on this C.A.T. subtest.

The same finding occurs with grade placement equivalents based upon Arithmetic test scores (Table 21). That is, the total experimental and control groups in both grades are from one to five months below the achievement level indicated by their actual grade placement. Performance at or above actual grade placement level occurs for experimental subjects in Elliott county (grades 1 and 2), Lee county (grade 2), and Morgan county (grade 2) and for control subjects in Morgan county (grade 2).

Finally, Table 22 indicates a similar overall pattern of underachievement (i.e., two to six months) when grade placement equivalents are based upon Language test scores. Only in Morgan county did experimental and control subjects (grade 2) exceed the level of achievement indicated by actual grade placement.

Due to the small number of subjects within each of the experimental and control groups per county, it is not possible to determine if observed differences in achievement level reflect true differences between county groups. These differences do suggest, however, that there may be some important exceptions to the overall conclusion that both experimental and control group children are functioning below the C.A.T. norms. In general, however, the second prediction in Hypotheses 2 and 3 that these children would be substandard in comparison to the C.A.T. norms is confirmed.

Other Findings: The Effects of Socioeconomic Status, Sex of Child and School of Enrollment Upon Achievement Scores

Due to the lack of significant differences between first and second grade former Project participants and non-participants in achievement test scores, it was of interest to determine whether achievement score differences were associated with the socioeconomic status (SES), sex or school of enrollment of the children in the sample.

In order to test for the effects related to SES among first grade subjects, C.A.T. subtest (Arithmetic, Language and Reading) and Total Battery raw scores were subjected to individual two-way analyses of covariance incorporating "Treatment" (two levels: former Project participants or experimental group versus non-participants or control group) and rated SES* (two levels: "average" versus "below average") with chronological age at time of testing as the only covariate. A total of 56 first grade pairs of experimental and control subjects matched in terms of sex and county school district were used for this analysis.** The number of subjects in each of the four cells was unequal, due to the presence of more male than female pairs and a larger number of subjects rated as "below average" in SES. Table 23 presents the cell means for each of the four comparison groups for each of the C.A.T. raw scores (subtests and Total Battery) employed as dependent variables in the analyses.

---

*These ratings of socioeconomic status were obtained from the child's current classroom teacher. Although teachers were instructed uniformly to rate children as "average" or "below average" in SES, it is likely that they varied from county to county in the standards of reference used to assign ratings.

**All subjects were Caucasian.

TABLE 23: MEAN C.A.T. SCORES OF FIRST GRADERS AS A FUNCTION OF SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

CONDITION	N	MEASURE			
		C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Total Raw Score
"Below Average SES"- Project Participation	46	32.24	18.74	29.54	80.52
"Below Average SES"- No Project Participation	43	34.30	19.07	29.12	82.49
"Average SES"- Project Participation	10	41.50	23.00	33.20	97.70
"Average SES"- No Project Participation	13	47.38	27.23	37.77	112.38

Tables 24 - 27 present the results of the four analyses of covariance. The main effect of SES is significant for each analysis (ρ =.05 or less), indicating that first grade subjects rated as "average" in SES scored significantly higher on C.A.T. subtests and the Total C.A.T. Battery compared to first grade subjects rated "below average". The main effect associated with treatment (Project participation) is not significant, nor is the interaction between SES and treatment significant in any of the analyses.

TABLE 24: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. ARITHMETIC AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF RATED SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Socioeconomic Status (SES)	1/107	5.95	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/107	0.66	NS
SES x P	1/107	0.20	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 25: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. LANGUAGE AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF RATED SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Socioeconomic Status (SES)	1/107	8.45	.005
Project Participation (P)	1/107	1.06	NS
SES x P	1/107	0.87	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 26: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. READING AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF RATED SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Socioeconomic Status (SES)	1/107	5.28	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/107	0.52	NS
SES x P	1/107	0.91	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 27: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. TOTAL RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF RATED SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Socioeconomic Status (SES)	1/107	7.74	.01
Project Participation (P)	1/107	0.86	NS
SES x P	1/107	0.61	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

2

The same analysis of covariance design was employed to determine the effects of SES and Project participation upon C.A.T. scores of 44 matched pairs of second graders. No significant main effects or interactions were obtained for these four analyses.

The effects of sex of child and treatment were assessed in the same fashion as in the above analyses. C.A.T. subtest and Total Battery scores were analyzed for 51 pairs of first grade subjects (matched in terms of SES and county school district) available for this comparison. No main effects or interactions attained the .05 level of significance.

Analyses performed for 72 (of whom 70 were members of matched pairs) second graders available for this analysis (see Table 28) indicate a significant main effect associated with sex of child in each case (ρ = .05 or less). Tables 29 through 32 present these results. On each C.A.T. subtest and on the Total Battery girls scored significantly higher than boys. Prior participation in the Project was not significant as a main effect nor was the interaction between sex of child and treatment significant.

TABLE 28: MEAN C.A.T. SCORES OF SECOND GRADERS AS A FUNCTION OF SEX AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

CONDITION	N	MEASURE			
		C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Total Raw Score
Males-Project Participation	20	65.65	37.75	55.40	157.80
Males-No Project Participation	19	59.74	36.68	52.00	148.42
Females-Project Participation	16	72.12	49.12	69.06	190.31
Females-No Project Participation	17	68.70	42.29	63.76	174.76

TABLE 29: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. ARITHMETIC AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF SEX AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Sex (S)	1/67	4.69	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/67	1.25	NS
S x P	1/67	0.11	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 30: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. LANGUAGE AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF SEX AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Sex (S)	1/67	6.91	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/67	1.38	NS
S x P	1/67	0.79	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 31: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. READING AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF SEX AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Sex (S)	1/67	10.31	.005
Project Participation (P)	1/67	0.81	NS
S x P	1/67	0.08	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 32: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. TOTAL RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF SEX AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Sex (S)	1/67	9.01	.005
Project Participation (P)	1/67	1.22	NS
S x P	1/67	0.12	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

From these analyses in this and the preceeding section, it can be generally concluded again that Project participation is not associated with any significant differences in C.A.T. scores in the present sample. Teacher rated SES is significantly associated with differences among first graders on all C.A.T. raw scores, whereas second grade girls score significantly higher than second grade boys on all subtests and the C.A.T. Total Battery.

The Effect of Title I Programs And Prior Project Participation Upon Achievement Test Scores

It was expected that children would differ significantly as a function of prior Project participation and participation in a Title I program during grades 1 and 2. According to the rankings of counties in terms of Title I programs in first and second grades the following analyses were performed:

First, experimental (former Project participants) and control (nonparticipants) first grade subjects were compared on the basis of C.A.T. subtest and Total Battery raw scores between the "Best Nine Month Title I" program (Floyd county, first grade only) and "No Title I" program (Elliott county). An analysis of covariance design was employed (chronological age at time of testing was the single covariate). Six pairs of experimental and control subjects (matched on the basis of sex and county school district*) were distributed equally between the "best Title I" and "no Title I" groups. In all cases, subjects were of below average SES designation. Although the ratio of male to female subjects was the same in both treatment groups it was not the same in the Title I comparison groups, i.e., there were more female subjects in the "no Title I" group and more males in the "best Title I" group.

---

*All subjects were Caucasian and "below average" in rated SES.

Table 33 presents the mean C.A.T. raw scores (subtest and Total Battery) for the four comparison groups. The results of the analyses performed on each of the C.A.T. raw scores indicate significant effects only for the Reading area subtest and Total Battery scores (Tables 34 and 35). For both of these scores, the main effect of the nine month Title I program is significant. Children in Elliott County ("no Title I") have significantly higher Reading and Total Battery scores than children in Floyd County ("best Title I") ($p=.05$ or less), a finding which is a reversal of the expected difference. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

TABLE 33: MEAN C.A.T. SCORES OF FIRST GRADERS AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

CONDITION	N	MEASURE			
		C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Total Raw Score
No Title I* Participation- Project Participation	6	46.17	21.67	40.83	108.67
No Title I Participation- No Project Participation	6	37.33	22.17	40.00	99.50
Participation In "Best" Nine Month Title I-** Project Participation	6	32.17	22.00	23.33	77.50
Participation In "Best" Nine Month Title I- No Project Participation	6	20.50	13.67	18.50	52.67

*No Title I - Elliott County

**"Best" Nine Month Title I - Floyd County

TABLE 34: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. READING AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Nine Month Title I (T)	1/19	25.70	.001
Project Participation (P)	1/19	0.36	NS
T x P	1/19	0.23	NS

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 35: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. TOTAL RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Nine Month Title I (T)	1/19	6.64	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/19	0.95	NS
T x P	1/19	0.23	NS

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

Second, the same analysis of covariance design was utilized to determine the effects of Project participation and nine month Title I participation for second grade subjects. The C.A.T. scores for eight pairs of experimental and control subjects (matched on rated SES)* distributed equally between Elliott county ("no Title I" program) and Owsley county ("best nine month Title I" program, second grade only) were analyzed. Each of the four comparison groups was equally divided between subjects rated as "average" and "below average" in SES.

---

*All subjects were Caucasian males.

Mean C.A.T. scores for each of the comparison groups are presented in Table 36. Results of four two-way analyses of covariance indicate a significant main effect of nine month Title I program for the Arithmetic, Language, and total battery raw scores (see Tables 37 through 39). As before, children from Elliott county ("no Title I" program) did significantly better on the C.A.T. than their second grade peers in Owsley county. No other effects were significant.

TABLE 36: MEAN C.A.T. SCORES OF SECOND GRADERS AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

CONDITION	N	MEASURE			
		C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Total Raw Score
No Title I* Participation- Project Participation	4	78.25	51.50	74.75	204.50
No Title I Participation- No Project Participation	4	68.00	35.50	58.25	161.75
Participation in "Best" Nine Month Title I-** Project Participation	4	51.75	26.75	43.50	122.00
Participation in "Best" Nine Month Title I- No Project Participation	4	42.50	31.75	41.00	115.25

*No Title I - Elliott County

**"Best" Nine Month Title I - Owsley County

TABLE 37: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. ARITHMETIC AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Nine Month Title I (T)	1/11	5.57	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/11	1.82	NS
T x P	1/11	0.10	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 38: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. READING AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Nine Month Title I (T)	1/11	7.16	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/11	1.50	NS
T x P	1/11	0.89	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

TABLE 39: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: SECOND GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. TOTAL RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN NINE MONTH TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Nine Month Title I (T)	1/11	5.73	.05
Project Participation (P)	1/11	1.78	NS
T x P	1/11	0.95	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

Third, the effect of "summer Title I only" (Knott county, first grade only) was compared to the effect of "no Title I" program (Elliott county) for 14 pairs of first grade experimental and control subjects (matched on sex and SES).* The ratio of males to females and of "average" to "below average" SES subjects was the same in each of the four comparison groups. Table 40 presents the mean C.A.T. scores for the four groups constituted on the basis of prior Project participation and Title I participation. The analysis of covariance** indicates a significant main effect associated with Title I participation for Reading Area raw scores only ($\rho < .005$) (see Table 41), i.e., first graders in Elliott county were superior in reading achievement to first graders in Knott county. No other effects were significant.

TABLE 40: MEAN C.A.T. SCORES OF FIRST GRADERS AS A FUNCTION OF SUMMER TITLE I PARTICIPATION AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

CONDITION	N	MEASURE			
		C.A.T. Arithmetic Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Language Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Reading Area Raw Score	C.A.T. Total Raw Score
No Title I* Participation-Project Participation	7	52.14	24.28	41.00	117.43
No Title I Participation-No Project Participation	7	45.00	25.57	41.43	112.00
Summer Title I** Participation-Project Participation	7	45.43	24.00	29.43	98.86
Summer Title I Participation-No Project Participation	7	45.71	23.14	26.57	95.43

*No Title I - Elliott County

**Summer Title I - Knott County

---

*All subjects were Caucasian.

**Chronological age was the single covariate.

TABLE 41: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: FIRST GRADE SAMPLE C.A.T. READING AREA RAW SCORE AS A FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION IN SUMMER TITLE I AND PRIOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

Source*	df	F	P
Summer Title I (ST)	1/23	13.94	.005
Project Participation (P)	1/23	0.03	NS
ST x P	1/23	0.26	NS

---

*Adjusted for the child's chronological age at the time of the C.A.T. testing.

Finally, the effects of prior Project participation and nine month versus summer only Title I participation were assessed by analyzing C.A.T. scores of eight pairs of experimental and control first grade subjects (matched on sex)* equally distributed between Floyd ("best Nine Month Title I program-first grade only) and Knott ("summer only" Title I program-first grade only) counties. Each of the four comparison groups was equally divided according to sex. None of the main effects or interactions were significant at the .05 level.

In summary, the foregoing analyses incorporating Title I and Project participation fail to indicate that Title I has any benefical effects, alone or in combination with Project participation, upon achievement test performance. The consistently superior achievement of children in Elliott county, especially in reading, where there was no Title I program during 1967-1968, may be due to a number of factors: 1) The Elliott county school, Sandy Hook, is located in the county seat, whereas the Floyd county school, McDowell Elementary, is more isolated. 2) Floyd county did not use Title I funds for a reading program during 1967-1968. 3) The Knott county school, Jones Fork, is a more isolated, rural school in comparison to Elliott Sandy Hook. 4) There is evidence that children from Elliott county constituting the second grade experimental group are somewhat older and more advantaged than experimental groups in other counties. Also, due to the very small numbers of subjects involved in all of the Title I analyses, the above findings should not be considered conclusive.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of analyses for Hypotheses 2 and 3 indicate clearly that children who participated in the Rural Child Care Project do not differ significantly from similarly disadvantaged children who did not participate in the Project in their scores on a standardized achievement test obtained at the first and second grade levels. Since no baseline achievement test scores were obtained for these children prior to first grade, it is difficult to interpret this finding. Several predictions regarding achievement test performance related to Project participation and to improvements in the Child Development Center Program have been included as part of the 1968-1969 research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project (pp. 7-8):

---

*All subjects were Caucasian and rated as "below average" in SES.

> "Hypothesis 3a: Former Project participants who were given the California Achievement Tests in March, 1968 while enrolled in the first grade will, at the time of the second administration of the California Achievement Tests in grade two, be superior in their performance to non-Project matched controls, who also were given the tests in the preceding year while enrolled in first grade."
>
> "3b: In addition, the improvement in performance on the California Achievement Tests from first to second grade will be greater for the Project participants than for the non-Project participants."
>
> "3c: Finally, the performance of Project participants who will be tested on the California Achievement Tests in second grade during March, 1969 will be superior to that of Project participants who were tested in the second grade in March, 1968."
>
> "Hypothesis 4: Former Project participants who were given the California Achievement Tests during March, 1968 while enrolled in second grade will show superiority on a test of academic achievement in third grade relative to their non-Project matched controls, who also were tested the preceding year on the California Achievement Tests."
>
> "Hypothesis 5: Children who attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty (60) days during the 1967-1968 school year and who will enter first grade during the fall of 1968 will show superiority in their performance on a standardized achievement test relative to the performance of former Project participants who were tested during the 1967-1968 school year while enrolled in first grade."

The rationale underlying these predictions is explained in the proposal as follows (p. 10):

> "It has generally been assumed that participation in a Head Start preschool program will subsequently produce discernible and lasting gains in academic achievement. Hypotheses 3a and 4 are designed to test this assumption. In addition, one might expect that former Project participants will show a greater rate of gain on an academic achievement test from one year to the next than their peers who have not had the experience of participating in the Child Development Program. Hypothesis 3b is designed to test this expectation.* Hypotheses 3c and 5, on the other hand, are designed to assess the impact of changes in the Child Development Program itself on the subsequent academic achievement of its participants. Changes in the Program were first introduced in the 1966-1967 fiscal year in order to further enrich the environment of the Child Development Centers, and additional changes were made in the 1967-1968 fiscal year.** Under the assumption that a more enriched preschool environment is conducive to heightened intellectual functioning, children who most recently participated in the Program during 1965-1966 and who were tested on the California Achievement Tests in 1968 in the latter half of grade two should exhibit a lower level of achievement than children who most recently participated in the Program during 1966-1967 and who will be tested in 1969 during the latter half of grade two. (Hypothesis 3c) The additional improvements made during the 1967-1968 fiscal year should be reflected in better performance on the California Achievement Tests in grade one among the 1967-1968 Project participants (who will be tested on the achievement battery in March, 1969) than was shown by the 1966-1967 Project participants whose academic achievement was measured at the grade one level during March, 1968. (Hypothesis 5)"

---

*According to Tiegs and Clark (1963), children typically show a gain in their absolute level of performance on the California Achievement Tests (Lower Primary Level) from one year to the next. Hypothesis 3b, however, asserts that the magnitude of the gain will be greater among former Project participants than among non-participants.

**During the 1966-1967 fiscal year the staff of the Child Development Centers received more training and on the average they had almost twice as much relevant work experience as they had had during the 1965-1966 fiscal year. In addition, the pupil-per-teacher ratio in the Child Development Centers was reduced and supervisory procedures were tightened. Changes made during the 1967-1968 fiscal year consisted of the implementation of a volunteer program and the reintroduction of the unit teaching method in the Child Development Centers. (The unit teaching method was first introduced in August, 1966 but it was neither emphasized nor uniformly used until December, 1967.)

With respect to the finding that Title I programs are unrelated to C.A.T. scores obtained by the subjects in the present study, further assessment of Title I programs in first through third grades is planned for 1968-1969. An attempt will be made to assess Title I programs independent of county school district in terms of specific services related to arithmetic, language and reading obtained through Title I or any other programs.

III. Household Conditions Rating Survey

Hypothesis 4 states that,

> "Project families who have received casework/homemaking services for a minimal period of six months will show a significant improvement in their patterns of household operation."

METHOD

The general method of collecting data to test this hypothesis was to rate household conditions over time among a sample of Project families for whom Project social services were initiated during the 1967-1968 fiscal year. The initial rating was made early in February, 1968, and the follow-up rating was accomplished during the latter half of June, 1968. Observations were made of household conditions in four areas: (1) adequacy of housing, (2) personal cleanliness and hygiene of family members, (3) nutrition and (4) safety and sanitation conditions within the home.

Subjects

The sample was composed of families admitted to the Project after May 31, 1967, who, as of December 31, 1967, were receiving Project social services on a more or less regular basis. Of families admitted to the Project since May 31, 1967, the only ones excluded from the sample were those who had never received Project social services on a regular basis, those for whom services were terminated prior to December 31, 1967, and those families who dropped out of the Project before December 31, 1967. The initial sample consisted of 92 families who met the above criteria. However, prior to the first survey, one potential male respondent (from Magoffin County) dropped out of the Project, leaving a potential sample of 91 families. Table 42 presents the distribution by county of the 91 families who were tentatively scheduled for the initial household survey and of the 66 who were actually visited. Table 43 summarizes the reasons 25 families were excluded from the first rating. In 55 of the 66 homes surveyed the respondent was the mother or mother-surrogate. In two homes the male head of the household was interviewed, while in the nine remaining cases both members were interviewed. Table 44 depicts the distribution by county of the 66 families who were scheduled to be visited for the follow-up or final household rating and of the 55 families who were actually visited. Table 45 presents a summary of the reasons for the exclusion of 11 families from the final survey. The 55 families who were seen twice made up the total sample for evaluating change in household conditions. In 50 of the 55 homes visited the second time, the respondent was the mother or mother-surrogate. In the five remaining cases both father and mother were interviewed. Table 46 presents the frequency and percentage of respondents by county participating in the initial and final surveys.

TABLE 42: FAMILIES BY COUNTY SCHEDULED FOR INITIAL HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY AND NUMBER OF RATINGS ACTUALLY CONDUCTED, JANUARY 31-FEBRUARY 7, 1968

County	Families Scheduled for Initial Household Rating	Families Actually Rated
Elliott	2	2
Floyd	13	8
Harlan	11	10
Knott	8	4
Lee	9	8
Letcher	8	7
Magoffin	11	5
Morgan	10	7
Owsley	14	11
Wolfe	5	4
TOTAL	91	66

TABLE 43: SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR EXCLUSION OF 25 TARGET FAMILIES FROM THE INITIAL HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY, JANUARY 31-FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Reasons for Exclusion	Number of Families Excluded
Family not home on scheduled date of visit	11
Death or serious illness in family	5
Household head works night shift and sleeps during day	2
Family housed in temporary quarters	1
Family withdrew from Project	2
Uncooperative	4
TOTAL	25

TABLE 44: FAMILIES BY COUNTY SCHEDULED FOR FINAL HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY AND NUMBER OF RATINGS ACTUALLY CONDUCTED, JUNE 17-JUNE 21, 1968.

County	Families Scheduled for Final Household Rating	Families Actually Rated
Elliott	2	2
Floyd	8	4
Harlan	10	10
Knott	4	3
Lee	8	8
Letcher	7	6
Magoffin	5	2
Morgan	7	6
Owsley	11	11
Wolfe	4	3
TOTAL	66	55

TABLE 45: SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR EXCLUSION OF 11 TARGET FAMILIES FROM THE FINAL HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY, JUNE 17-JUNE 21, 1968.

Reasons for Exclusion	Number of Families Excluded
Family not home on scheduled date of visit	3
Family withdrew from Project	1
Uncooperative	5
Family moved	2
TOTAL	11

TABLE 46: FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE: FEBRUARY 1968 AND JUNE 1968

COUNTY	INITIAL SURVEY 2-68		FINAL SURVEY 6-68	
	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent
Elliott	2	3.03	2	3.64
Floyd	8	12.12	4	7.27
Harlan	10	15.15	10	18.18
Knott	4	6.06	3	5.45
Lee	8	12.12	8	14.55
Letcher	7	10.61	6	10.91
Magoffin	5	7.58	2	3.64
Morgan	7	10.61	6	10.91
Owsley	11	16.67	11	20.00
Wolfe	4	6.06	3	5.45
TOTAL	66	100.01%	55	100.00%

Four of these 55 families who participated in both surveys moved into a different dwelling during the interim between the initial and follow-up surveys. In one case where a family was surveyed twice, data were incomplete for the final survey.*

Fifteen of these families that were interviewed twice on Household Rating Scales also participated in both sessions of the Fear and Freedom Attitude Scale interviewing (see Section IV). In ten instances, the respondent was the mother or mother-surrogate only. In one case the father alone was interviewed while in the remaining four cases both members were interviewed. Eleven of the families who participated in both Household Rating Scales were also interviewed twice on the Education Scale (see Section V). The mother only was the respondent in nine instances, and in no case was the father alone interviewed. In the remaining two cases both father and mother were interviewed. No families who participated twice on Household Rating Scales were interviewed twice on both the Fear and Freedom and the Education Scales.

---

*This occurred because the respondent was interviewed in the county Social Worker's office and not at home on the final survey. Thus, data could only be obtained for the questions pertaining to nutrition.

Classification of Respondents

For purposes of data analysis, all families who participated in the February, 1968, survey were classified by the Project Director according to the predominant type of social service they were receiving as of February, 1968, and again as of June, 1968. The four classifications used are as follows:

1 - Homemaker Group

The ultimate objective of Homemaking service, according to the Project Director, is "to effect improvement in the areas of (1) nutrition, (2) safety and sanitation and (3) general housekeeping". The Homemaker serves primarily in a teaching capacity rather than as a maid or temporary housekeeper in times of family crisis, which has been the traditional role of Homemaking social services. (It is important to note that the Homemaker's method of operation is to get the family to indicate where they think help is needed and then to provide that help. The Homemaking service as provided in this Project is extremely non-directive. For example, the Homemaker does not attempt to effect improvement in nutrition unless the family overtly indicates that help is needed and desired in that area.)*

General improvement for Homemaking families was predicted in the following areas: 1) Housing, i.e., in the adequacy of heat and ventilation and the adequacy of protection from pests; 2) Nutrition, i.e., specifically in the consumption of proteins and fresh fruits and vegetables; 3) Personal cleanliness and hygiene, i.e., in terms of the cleanliness (outer appearance) of parents and children; and 4) Safety and sanitation, i.e., general residential safety, sanitary waste disposal, storage of food, and overall cleanliness of the house.

Placement of a Homemaker with a family is done only after the family, which has been designated as in need of Homemaking services (by the Social Worker), agrees to accept the Homemaker. The number of hours per week that a Homemaker spends with a given family is highly variable depending upon need, the family's ability to cooperate, and the type of activities chosen. Typically, a Homemaker would be expected to spend 2½ hours per week with each family in her caseload.

---

*This information was not obtained until after all data were collected.

2 & 3 - Social Worker & Case Aide Groups

The Social Worker provides protective service work to children and their families enrolled in the Project. One of the main functions of the Social Worker is to assist family members in making proper use of their resources and utilizing other resources available to them. The Case Aide* under supervision of the Social Worker provides these same services to Project families. The primary reasons for distinguishing Social Worker from Case Aide families is that the persons occupying the Social Worker positions are more educated and more experienced in this line of work than are the persons in Case Aide positions. According to the Project Director, the ultimate objectives of the Social Worker and Case Aide are to "(1) motivate families to become involved in their communities and (2) expose them to social services which are available to their local communities". The majority of families with which the Social Worker or Case Aide works are those who seem to need little more than occasional visits from some Project-connected person to encourage them to continue to keep their child in the Child Development Center. These are families who seem to be functioning as adequately as possible on a minimal income. However, because of the unwillingness of some families to accept a Homemaker or due to the limited supply of Homemakers, both the Social Worker and Case Aide work with some cases of the type with which the Homemaker generally works.

Although general improvement in the areas of housing, nutrition, personal cleanliness, and safety and sanitation was expected among families receiving Homemaking services, families receiving Case Aide or Social Worker contact services were not expected to show as many or as great gains since such service consists primarily of encouraging families to avail themselves of social services provided by other community agencies.

4 - Homemaker Multiproblem Group

The Homemaker Multiproblem family differs from families designated as Homemaker primarily in terms of the number and/or severity of their "social" problems and in terms of the amount of attention they receive from the Homemaker. Generally both the Homemaker and Social Worker work together on these cases with the Homemaker spending more time with the family than the usual 2½ hours per week. General improvement in all areas was predicted for Homemaker Multiproblem families, with the reservation that it might not occur to the same extent as expected in Homemaker families because of the greater number and severity of problems they face.

---

*The position of Case Aide has been discontinued in the Rural Child Care Project as of June 30, 1968.

Tables 47 and 48 present the distributions of families among the four Project social service groups as defined in the preceding discussion. Because some three families changed groups between the initial and final surveys of household conditions (see Table 48), all analyses of change in household conditions are based on comparisons between groups as they were constituted in June, 1968. Comparisons utilizing data from the initial survey only were based on groups as they were constituted in February, 1968.

TABLE 47: DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES SURVEYED INITIALLY IN FEBRUARY, 1968, BY COUNTY AND SERVICE RECEIVED

	Homemaking	Social Worker	Case Aide	Homemaking Multiproblem	Total
Elliott	1	0	1	0	2
Floyd	5	1	1	1	8
Harlan	3	6	0	1	10
Knott	0	0	2	2	4
Lee	6	0	0	2	8
Letcher	1	0	3	3	7
Magoffin	2	1	1	1	5
Morgan	3	1	2	1	7
Owsley	5	0	4	2	11
Wolfe	4	0	0	0	4
TOTAL	30	9	14	13	66

TABLE 48: DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES SURVEYED FOR THE SECOND TIME IN JUNE, 1968 BY COUNTY AND SERVICE RECEIVED

	Homemaking	Social Worker	Case Aide	Homemaking Multiproblem	Total
Elliott	1	0	1	0	2
Floyd	3	0	0	1	4
Harlan	4*	5	0	1	10
Knott	0	0	1	2	3
Lee	4	1**	1***	2	8
Letcher	1	0	2	3	6
Magoffin	0	1	1	0	2
Morgan	2	1	2	1	6
Owsley	5	0	4	2	11
Wolfe	3	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	23	8	12	12	55

*During the period between February, 1968 and June, 1968, one family changed from Social Worker to Homemaking.

**During the period between February, 1968 and June, 1968, one family changed from Homemaking to Social Worker.

***During the period between February, 1968 and June, 1968, one family changed from Homemaking to Case Aide.

Materials

There were three sets of materials used in the survey.

The Household Conditions Rating Scales (see Appendix B), which were approved by the Office of Research and Evaluation in January, 1968, were constructed by the Research Staff. During the process of selecting items for inclusion in the questionnaire, a number of officials in various state departments were consulted.* The U.S. Census Criteria for Housing were also taken into consideration. In choosing items for this scale it was necessary to be highly selective because of the nature of the target population and because none of the Research Staff are experts on standards for adequate housing, plumbing, or lighting. Sections on housing, nutrition, personal cleanliness and hygiene, safety and sanitation, and biographical data were included in this scale.

In addition to the Household Rating Scales, criteria for assigning household ratings were devised by the Research Staff and approved by the Head Start Office of Research and Evaluation (see Appendix C).

The third set of material, the Household Conditions Rating Survey Interview Form (see Appendix D), was the modified questionnaire used for the actual home visits. In this instrument the order of presentation of scale items was changed slightly to facilitate the collection of data; however, the content of the scales was not disturbed. This form also includes a detailed description of the interviewing procedures to be followed by each interviewer and the procedures for gaining admission to households.

Interviewing Procedure

The interviewers for the February survey consisted exclusively of full-time permanent members of the Research Staff. For the June survey, interviewers were two Research Staff members and two consultants hired specifically for purposes of completing this survey.

Each of the persons who served as interviewers for these surveys received approximately one week of intensive training before going into the field. Training consisted of lectures, discussions and role playing.

The Program Director gave specific instructions that families were not to be told when to expect the interviewers or the specific purpose of the visits. However, the Social Workers (or Case Aides and Homemakers if they assisted in contacting the target families to arrange for an appointment) were instructed that they could mention to the families in the target population that they might bring some people who worked with them by to "visit". It appeared that in both the February and June surveys, some of the families visited had been forewarned as to the specific nature of the researcher's visit.

The procedure for the Household Rating Survey began with a brief interview, generally conducted in the living room of the family's home, during which the Nutrition Scale and Biographical Data Section were completed and questions pertaining to the Housing, Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene, and Safety and Sanitation Scales were asked. The interviewer then asked to see the kitchen and bathroom. (If there was no plumbing, the interviewer asked to see the kitchen, the source of drinking water, and the privy.) During this tour,* observations as to the general condition and cleanliness of the house were mentally noted in order to complete the Household Rating Scale upon leaving the home. Permission was requested to walk around the exterior of the house as the final part of the survey. Data for the Housing and Safety and Sanitation Scales particularly were collected through this inspection. The respondent was thanked and in the February survey, a future visit was mentioned.

---

*e.g., an expert on pit privys and a nutritionist from the Kentucky State Health Department, and an expert on building codes from the Franklin County Health Department.

In all but four cases, the initial and final ratings for a given family in the sample were performed by different raters.**

Scoring Procedures

Each section of the Household Conditions Rating Scales (see Appendix B) was scored separately for purposes of analysis. Data gathered for each sub-area of the Housing section of the survey (Structural Soundness, Heat and Ventilation, Plumbing Facilities, Cooking Equipment, Person Per Room Ratio, Protection From Pests and Overall Adequacy) were rated on a three point scale. A rating of "1" indicates "inadequate" conditions, a rating of "2" represents "minimal adequacy" and a rating of "3" represents "optimal adequacy". Ratings of Overall Adequacy were obtained by summating ratings of all of the sub-areas. For each sub-area of the Housing section, the mean and median ratings for each of the four classification groups (Social Worker, Case Aide, Homemaker and Homemaker Multiproblem families) on the initial and follow-up surveys were determined. Information obtained on the Nutrition section of the survey (Proteins, Fresh Fruit and Vegetables and Other Food Stuffs) was rated on a similar three point scale, i.e., a rating of "1" represents a judgment of "unsatisfactory" family nutrition in a given sub-area, whereas a rating of "3" indicates that the family's nutrition in a given sub-area was judged to be "satisfactory". Mean and median ratings for each of the four classifications of Project families were then obtained for the three sub-areas of Nutrition on the initial and final surveys.

Data on Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene as well as data obtained on Safety and Sanitation (Residential Safety, Adequacy of Waste Disposal, Adequacy of Water Supply, Adequacy of Food Storage Methods,

---

*The County Program Staff member accompanying the interviewer was instructed to stay with the interviewer at all times while in the Project homes.

**One family in Elliott County and three families in Morgan County were rated by the same interviewer on the initial and final survey.

Cleanliness of House and Overall Adequacy) were scored according to a two point scale classification. That is, a given item was assigned a score of "1" if the interviewer found evidence of dirty or unhygienic personal appearance or of unsafe or unsanitary conditions. Items for which there was evidence of personal cleanliness and hygiene or of safe or sanitary conditions were assigned a score of "2". Item scores for each sub-area of these two sections of the survey were then summed and the mean and median scores for each sub-area obtained for each of the four classification groups of Project families receiving social services.

The complete criteria for scoring each section of the Household Conditions Rating Survey are presented in Appendix C.

RESULTS

Prior to the presentation of the results of analyses performed to evaluate Hypothesis 4, findings are presented on the amount and type of Project services received by families in the four classification groups prior to the initial Household Conditions Rating Survey and during the interim between the initial and the follow-up survey. In addition, general demographic data for the total sample of Project families surveyed are discussed.

Two general methods were employed to evaluate Hypothesis 4. First, the significance of change in Household Conditions ratings in the areas of Housing, Nutrition, Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene, and Safety and Sanitation was assessed separately for each of the four groups of Project parents classified according to type of Project services received (Social Work, Case Aide, Homemaking or Homemaking Multiproblem). All analyses of changes in ratings included only those Project parents who served as respondents for both the initial and follow-up surveys in February and June of 1968. All comparisons of changes in ratings utilized non-parametric tests of significance. Specifically, the Sign Test (Siegel, 1956) was used to evaluate change in the areas of Housing and Nutrition. Significance of change in the areas of Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene and Safety and Sanitation was evaluated by the McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes including correction for continuity (Siegel, 1956). In cases where the use of the McNemar Test was inappropriate (i.e., the expected frequencies were less than 5), the Binomial Test (Siegel, 1956) was substituted.

Second, because of the essential similarity between Social Work and Case Aide families on the one hand and Homemaking and Homemaking Multiproblem families on the other in terms of the major type of Project social services received (see Table 49), the four classification groups were collapsed into two groups designated as "Homemaking" and "Non-Homemaking" families. Between groups comparisons were then performed separately for initial and follow-up Household Conditions Ratings by means of the Median Test (Siegel, 1956). The two groups were compared in terms of the number of respondents above and below the combined median of each sub-area in the four areas of the Household Conditions Rating Survey.

The level of significance chosen for all analyses was $\rho <.10$, due to the exploratory nature of the study and the non-parametric measures employed .

Project Social Services Received by Each Family Group

Table 49 presents the mean number of Social Worker, Case Aide, and Homemaker visits paid to each of the families who participated in the initial and follow-up surveys. It is evident that for each of the four groups of families classified according to the major type of Project services received as many or more visits were paid to the families by Project personnel prior to the initial rating in February, 1968, as were paid during the interim between initial and follow-up ratings (June, 1968). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that initial ratings were spuriously high since they were not obtained prior to the initiation of Project services to these families. Any analysis of changes in ratings from the initial to the final survey would be affected by this failure to obtain initial ratings on families earlier in their Project experience.* For this reason alone it would be expected that Project family groups would be less likely to show significant change over time in Household Conditions ratings.

Table 49 also presents evidence in support of the system used to classify families in this study. In each group the greatest number of visits was paid to families by the Project worker responsible for delivering the Project service by which the families had been classified. Although all families were routinely visited by the Social Worker or Case Aide, it is clear from Table 49 that the Homemaker and Homemaker Multiproblem family groups had the most Homemaker visits, that Social Worker families had the most Social Worker visits, and that the Case Aide families had the most Case Aide visits. A comparison of the overall number of visits paid by Social Workers, Case Aides and Homemakers to families in each of the four classification groups indicates that Homemaker Multiproblem families received the most visits, followed closely by Homemaker families. Social Worker and Case Aide families received fewer total visits from the Project staff.

Table 49 also indicates that the classification of families into four groups on the basis of the major type of Project social services they received did not yield four "pure" treatment groups. All groups, despite the major type of service received, had visits from other Project staff. For example, a small number of Homemaker visits were paid to the Social Worker and Case Aide family groups. No assessment of the purpose or extent of these visits was made. The fact that the four classification groups were not mutually exclusive with respect to type of Project services received would argue against finding group differences in Household Conditions ratings over time as a function of exposure to Project social services.

---

*Delay of the initial survey occurred because food and clothing were delivered in early December to Project families which would have contaminated an initial rating obtained in December.

TABLE 49: MEAN NUMBER OF SOCIAL WORKER, CASE AIDE AND HOMEMAKING VISITS RECEIVED BY RESPONDENTS IN THE FOUR HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY CLASSIFICATION GROUPS PRIOR TO THE FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY AND DURING THE INTERVAL BETWEEN THE FEBRUARY 1968 AND JUNE 1968 SURVEYS

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	Mean Number of Visits Occurring Prior to February 1968 Survey			Mean Number of Visits Occurring Between February - June Surveys		
	Social Worker Visits	Case Aide Visits	Homemaker Visits	Social Worker Visits	Case Aide Visits	Homemaker Visits
Homemaker Family (n=23)	7.4	0.7	18.1	9.9	0.3	19.6
Case Aide Family (n=12)	5.2	5.7	2.2	2.2	5.7	1.5
Social Worker Family (n=8)	8.5	0.9	1.1	10.1	1.5	1.4
Homemaker Multiproblem Family (n=12)	7.8	1.2	25.9	7.3	0.0	25.6

*Respondents are classified on the basis of the type of service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

General Findings: A Descriptive Profile of Project Families Surveyed

A detailed presentation of demographic data obtained on the initial and follow-up Household Conditions Rating Surveys is found in Appendix E. Using initial survey data obtained from the 55 Project families* who were surveyed twice, the following descriptive profile of the total sample emerges:

Welfare Status. On the initial survey, 32.7% of the respondents reported they were receiving Public Assistance or some form of welfare allottment, and 65.5% were receiving food stamps. Only 32.7% of the families owned their homes, whereas 61.8% were renting.

Household Conditions. Of those families surveyed twice, 89.1% were rated on the initial interview (February, 1968) as having inadequately heated homes,** heating hazards were observed in 74.5% of the homes, 30% of the homes had leaking roofs, 12.7% had less than one operable window per inhabited room, and 9.1% of the homes had broken window panes. On the initial survey, 81.8% of the homes had more than one person per habitable room. In terms of plumbing, the majority (63.6%) of families had no running (piped) water, 14.5% had only cold running water, 76.4% had no operable flush toilet, 63.6% had no kitchen sink, 80.0% had no lavatory, and 78.2% of the homes had no bathtub or shower. Interviewers noted that 5.5% of the kitchens had no gas or electric range in working order and that 27.3% of the families used kerosene, wood or coal as cooking fuel. A majority (65.5%) of homes lacked window screens, 43.6% had no door screens, 72.7% of the families occupied dwellings with unprotected foundations, and 52.2% of the respondents complained of rodent infestation in the house.

Nutrition. Detailed demographic data are not presented in Appendix for the consumption of proteins, fresh fruits and vegetables, and other foodstuffs (e.g., cereals and grains). Only 7.3% of the families initially were rated by nutritionists from the Kentucky State Department of Health as inadequate in overall nutrition. In terms of specific nutritional inadequacies, 14.5% were rated as inadequate in protein consumption, 61.8% of the families were rated as inadequate in consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables, and 12.7% received inadequate ratings for other foodstuffs. Initially 83.6% of the families reported they planned to raise a garden (at the time of the follow-up survey, 85.5% of these same families were raising gardens).

---

*In 50 of the families interviewed twice, the mother was the sole respondent, and in the remaining five families, both parents were interviewed.

**The guidelines employed for ratings of Household Conditions, Nutrition, Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene, and Safety and Sanitation are found in Appendix C .

Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene. Based upon observations of external appearance, 41.8% of the adults present in the home at the time of the initial survey were judged to be wearing tattered clothing, 47.3% wore extremely dirty clothing, and 18.2% were found to have an accumulation of dirt observable on their hands, faces, ears, necks or hair. Observations of children present at the initial interview indicate that 30.8% of them were dressed in tattered clothes, 53.8% were attired in very dirty clothing, 41.0% were observed with accumulated dirt on their hands and faces, and 33.3% also had accumulated filth on their ears, necks or hair. However, only 7.3% of the parents reported that they bathed their children less than once a week. As many as 25.6% of the children in the homes were dressed inappropriately for the season, and only 17.9% of the parents claimed to possess adequate wearing apparel for their children. A few (5.5%) of the families were found to have an inadequate supply of eating utensils for each family member.

Safety and Sanitation. At the time of the initial survey, 70.9% of the Project families were living in homes where the surrounding yard was observed to be hazardous for children, and 47.3% of the homes had hazardous flooring inside the house. A few (1.8%) of the homes were totally without electricity. Many families were living in unsanitary surroundings, i.e., 47.3% of the homes were littered with garbage and other debris, 30.9% of the families disposed of garbage less than one a day, 75.9% did not employ adequate garbage disposal methods, 34.5% had an accumulation of dirty dishes in the kitchen and 25.5% of the homes had extremely dirty floors. Only 3.6% of the families were observed to keep farm animals inside the house and only 5.5% of the families that kept cats or dogs indoors were not properly disposing of their waste matter. Few (5.5%) homes had inadequate storage facilities for perishable foodstuffs, whereas 61.8% lacked adequate storage facilities for non-perishables. Some (3.6%) of the families had no toilet facilities whatsoever (flush toilet or privy). A third (35.8%) of those families with toilet facilities had unsanitary outlets. Of the 13 families having flush toilets, 61.5% maintained them in an unclean condition. Of the 40 families using pit privies, 100.0% were rated as having inadequately constructed or unsanitary facilities. The source of drinking water was rated as inadequate in 72.7% of the homes and 21.8% of the families did not have an adequate water supply for bathing.

Changes in Housing Ratings

Significance of change from initial to follow-up rating in each of the sub-areas of the Housing section* of the Household Conditions Rating Survey was evaluated separately for each of the four classification groups (Social Work, Case Aide, Homemaking, and Homemaking Multiproblem families). Tables 50 and 51 present the mean and median ratings for the initial (February, 1968) and follow-up (June, 1968) surveys for each of the six sub-areas within the Housing section and for Overall Adequacy. Table 52 summarizes the results of the Sign Test (Siegel, 1956) used to evaluate the significance of changes in ratings. Only Homemaking Multiproblem families showed any significant change. This group showed significant improvement in terms of Overall Adequacy ratings from initial to follow-up surveys ($\rho < .09$).

---

*Structural Soundness, Heat and Ventilation, Plumbing Facilities, Cooking Equipment, Person Per Room Ratio, Protection From Pests, and Overall Adequacy.

It should be noted that the evaluation of change in ratings of the adequacy of the Person Per Room ratio is questionable due to the fact that many respondents were not living in the same dwelling for both surveys. Also, as Table 53 indicates, the number of habitable rooms reported initially does not equal the number reported on the follow-up survey in all instances because interviewers often had to rely upon the respondent's verbal report for this information.

Changes in Nutrition Ratings

Tables 54 and 55 present the mean and median ratings on the initial (February, 1968) and follow-up (June, 1968) Household Conditions Rating Surveys for the section on Nutrition (Proteins, Fresh Fruits and Vegetables, and Other Foodstuffs) separately for the Social Work, Case Aide, Homemaking and Homemaking Multiproblem families. Table 56 summarizes the results of the Sign Test performed to assess the significance of changes in ratings from initial to final survey. Significant change occurred only for Case Aide families in terms of improvement over time in consumption of Other Foodstuffs (cereals and grains) ($\rho < .09$).

Changes in Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene Ratings

Table 57 presents for each of the Project services classification groups the median number of adults and children present in the home when the initial and follow-up Household Conditions Rating Surveys were conducted. Observations of the outer physical appearance of these persons provided the data for the evaluation of this portion of Hypothesis 4. Change in Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene was not evaluated for children since in a number of cases the same children were not present in the home for both surveys.

The McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes (Siegel, 1956) was used to assess improvement in Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene from initial to follow-up rating for adults in the Homemaking and Homemaking Multiproblem categories. Changes shown by adults in the Social Work and Case Aide categories were assessed by the Binomial Test (Siegel, 1956) since the McNemar Test was inappropriate for these comparisons.* These tests failed to reveal any significant changes in Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene for adults in any of the four classification groups.

---

*The expected frequencies in some cells were less than five.

TABLE 50: MEAN AND MEDIAN INITIAL RATINGS* OF ADEQUACY OF HOUSING CONDITIONS OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS SURVEY RESPONDENTS: FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY

HOUSING CONDITION	RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION**							
	Homemaker Family (n=23)		Case Aide Family (n=12)		Social Work Family (n=8)		Homemaker Multiproblem Family (n=12)	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Structural Soundness	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.0
Heat and Ventilation	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.0
Plumbing Facilities	1.2	1.0	1.7	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.0
Cooking Equipment	2.6	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.1	2.0	2.7	3.0
Person Per Room Ratio	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.0
Protection From Pests	1.3	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.6	1.0	1.4	1.0
Overall Adequacy***	8.4	8.0	9.8	9.0	8.9	8.5	9.2	8.5

*Three-point rating scales were used to rate the adequacy of each of the housing conditions identified above. For Structural Soundness a score of 1 represents "dilapidated", 2 represents "deteriorating" and 3 represents "sound". For the remaining housing conditions, 1 represents "inadequate", 2 represents "minimal adequacy" and 3 represents "optimal adequacy".

**Respondents are classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

***Ratings of "Overall Adequacy" were obtained by summating ratings of "Structural Soundness", "Heat and Ventilation", "Plumbing Facilities", "Cooking Equipment", "Person Per Room Ratio" and "Protection From Pests".

TABLE 51: MEAN AND MEDIAN SECOND RATINGS* OF ADEQUACY OF HOUSING CONDITIONS OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS SURVEY RESPONDENTS: JUNE 1968 SURVEY

HOUSING CONDITION	RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION**							
	Homemaker Family (n=23)		Case Aide Family (n=12)		Social Work Family (n=8)		Homemaker Multiproblem Family (n=12)	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Structural Soundness	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.0
Heat and Ventilation	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.0
Plumbing Facilities	1.2	1.0	1.6	1.0	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.0
Cooking Equipment	2.6	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.0
Person Per Room Ratio	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.0
Protection From Pests	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.5	1.0
Overall Adequacy***	8.4	8.0	9.2	8.5	9.1	9.5	9.7	8.5

*Three-point rating scales were used to rate the adequacy of each of the housing conditions identified above. For Structural Soundness a score of 1 represents "dilapidated", 2 represents "deteriorating", and 3 represents "sound". For the remaining housing conditions, 1 represents "inadequate", 2 represents "minimal adequacy" and 3 represents "optimal adequacy".

**Respondents are classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

***Ratings of "Overall Adequacy" were obtained by summating ratings of "Structural Soundness", "Heat and Ventilation", "Plumbing Facilities", "Cooking Equipment", "Person Per Room Ratio" and "Protection From Pests".

TABLE 52: SUMMARY OF SIGN TEST RESULTS: SIGNIFICANCE OF CHANGE SHOWN BY HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS BETWEEN FEBRUARY 1968 AND JUNE 1968 IN ADEQUACY OF HOUSING CONDITIONS

	RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION*			
HOUSING CONDITION RATED	Homemaking Family (n=23)	Case Aide Family (n=12)	Social Worker Family (n=8)	Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)
Structural Soundness	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS
Heat & Ventilation	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS
Plumbing Facilities	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS
Cooking Equipment	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS
Person Per Room Ratio	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS
Protection From Pests	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS
Overall Adequacy**	p=NS	p=NS	p=NS	p=.06†

*For purposes of the Sign Test analyses, the respondents were classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

**Initial and follow-up ratings of "Overall Adequacy" were obtained by summating ratings of "Structural Soundness", "Heating & Ventilation", "Plumbing Facilities", "Cooking Equipment", "Person Per Room Ratio" and "Protection From Pests".

†Change was in the direction of improvement.

TABLE 53: MEAN NUMBER OF PERSONS PER ROOM RESIDING IN HOMES VISITED DURING THE FEBRUARY AND JUNE 1968 HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEYS

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION*	FEBRUARY 1968			JUNE 1968		
	No. of Persons Residing In Home	No. of Habitable Rooms In Home**	No. of Persons Per Room	No. of Persons Residing In Home	No. of Habitable Rooms In Home**	No. of Persons Per Room
Homemaking Family (n=23)	7.2	4.4	1.8	7.2	4.3	1.8
Case Aide Family (n=12)	6.4	4.7	1.4	6.3	4.9	1.3
Social Worker Family (n=8)	6.8	5.1	1.4	6.5	5.6	1.7
Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)	7.2	3.8	2.0	7.1	3.9	1.9

*Respondents are classified on the basis of the type of service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

**Including the kitchen and excluding the bathroom (if any). The discrepancy in the number of rooms reported on initial and followup surveys is due to the interviewer being told how many rooms there were in the home, and to the several respondents who were living in a different dwelling at the time of the final survey than the one they occupied when they were surveyed initially.

TABLE 54: MEAN AND MEDIAN INITIAL RATINGS* OF ADEQUACY OF FOODSTUFFS SERVED BY HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS SURVEY RESPONDENTS: FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION**	FOOD GROUPS RATED					
	PROTEINS		FRESH FRUITS & VEGETABLES		OTHER FOODSTUFFS	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Homemaking Family (n=23)	2.2	2.0	1.5	1.0	2.5	3.0
Case Aide Family (n=12)	2.0	2.0	1.4	1.0	2.1	2.0
Social Work Family (n=8)	2.4	2.0	1.4	1.0	2.2	2.0
Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)	2.1	2.0	1.4	1.0	2.2	2.5

*Three-point rating scales were used to rate the nutritional adequacy of each of the major food groupings identified above. Ratings were assigned so that a score of 1 represented a judgment of "unsatisfactory," and 3 represented a judgment of "satisfactory."

**Respondents are classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

TABLE 55: MEAN AND MEDIAN SECOND RATINGS* OF ADEQUACY OF FOODSTUFFS SERVED BY HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS SURVEY RESPONDENTS: JUNE 1968 SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION**	FOOD GROUPS RATED					
	PROTEINS		FRESH FRUITS & VEGETABLES		OTHER FOODSTUFFS	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Homemaking Family (n=23)	2.3	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.6	3.0
Case Aide Family (n=12)	2.4	2.5	1.7	1.5	2.4	3.0
Social Work Family (n=8)	2.5	2.5	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.0
Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)	2.1	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	3.0

*Three-point rating scales were used to rate the nutritional adequacy of each of the major food groupings identified above. Ratings were assigned so that a score of 1 represented a judgment of "unsatisfactory," and 3 represented a judgment of "satisfactory."

**Respondents are classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

TABLE 56: SUMMARY OF SIGN TEST RESULTS: SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPROVEMENT SHOWN BY HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS BETWEEN FEBRUARY 1968 AND JUNE 1968 IN ADEQUACY OF FOODSTUFFS SERVED IN THE HOME

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION*	FOOD GROUPS RATED		
	PROTEINS	FRESH FRUITS & VEGETABLES	OTHER FOODSTUFFS
Homemaker Families (n=23)	ρ=NS	ρ=NS	ρ=NS
Case Aide Families (n=12)	ρ=NS	ρ=NS	ρ=.09†
Social Worker Families (n=8)	ρ=NS	ρ=NS	ρ=NS
Homemaking Multiproblem Families (n=12)	ρ=NS	ρ=NS	ρ=NS

*For purposes of the Sign Test analyses, the respondents were classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

†Change was in the direction of improvement.

TABLE 57: MEDIAN NUMBER OF ADULTS AND CHILDREN PRESENT IN THE HOME DURING THE FEBRUARY 1968 AND JUNE 1968 HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEYS

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION*	FEBRUARY 1968		JUNE 1968	
	No. of Adults	No. of Children†	No. of Adults	No. of Children†
Homemaking Family (n=23)	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Case Aide Family (n=12)	1.0	1.5	1.0	2.5
Social Worker Family (n=8)	1.5	1.0	2.0	2.5
Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0

*Respondents are classified on the basis of the type of service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

†In many cases the children present in the home for the initial rating were not the same children present for the second rating.

Changes in Safety and Sanitation Ratings

Mean and median scores for each of the five sub-areas* of the Safety and Sanitation section of the Household Conditions Rating Survey are presented for the initial (February, 1968) and follow-up (June, 1968) surveys separately for each of the Project services classification groups in Tables 58 and 59 . The results of the non-parametric tests** performed to assess the significance of change in Safety and Sanitation socres are summarized in Table 60.

These analyses indicate that significant improvement occurred in the Case Aide, Social Work and Homemaking Multiproblem groups in terms of Safety and Sanitation Overall Adequacy ($\rho < .06 - .09$). In addition, the Homemaking Multiproblem group showed significant improvement in the specific area of Residential Safety from the initial to the follow-up survey ($\rho < .06$).

---

*Residential Safety, Adequacy of Waste Disposal, Adequacy of Water Supply, Adequacy of Food Storage Methods, and Cleanliness of House.

**The McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes was used to evaluate change in ratings shown by Homemaking families, whereas the Binomial Test was employed to assess the significance of change in ratings shown by the Social Work, Case Aide and Homemaking Multiproblem families, i.e., in those cases where expected cell frequencies were less than five, rendering the McNemar Test inappropriate (Siegel, 1956).

TABLE 58: MEAN AND MEDIAN INITIAL SANITATION AND SAFETY SCORES FOR HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS: FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY

HOUSING CONDITION	RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION*							
	Homemaking Family (n=23)		Case Aide Family (n=12)		Social Work Family (n=8)		Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Residential Safety [3-6]**	4.7	5.0	5.2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.0
Adequacy of Waste Disposal [5-10]	7.4	7.5	7.8	8.0	7.6	7.5	7.7	8.0
Adequacy of Water Supply [2-4]	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	2.8	3.0
Adequacy of Food Storage Methods [2-4]	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.0
Cleanliness of House [5-10]	8.9	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.4	9.5	8.2	8.0
Overall Adequacy*** [17-34]	27.5	27.0	28.2	27.5	28.8	28.0	26.4	27.0

*Respondents are classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

**The numbers in brackets presented along with each of the conditions identified above represent the minimum and maximum scores attainable for that section of the survey.

***Initial and follow-up estimates of "Overall Adequacy" were obtained by summating scores for "Residential Safety", "Adequacy of Waste Disposal", "Adequacy of Water Supply", "Adequacy of Food Storage Methods" and "Cleanliness of House".

TABLE 59: MEAN AND MEDIAN SECOND SANITATION AND SAFETY SCORES FOR HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS: JUNE 1968 SURVEY

HOUSING CONDITION	RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION*							
	Homemaking Family (n=23)		Case Aide Family (n=12)		Social Work Family (n=8)		Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Residential Safety [3-6]**	4.7	5.0	5.2	5.5	5.2	5.0	4.9	5.0
Adequacy of Waste Disposal [5-10]	7.5	8.0	7.9	8.0	8.4	8.5	7.7	7.0
Adequacy of Water Supply [2-4]	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.5	2.8	3.0
Adequacy of Food Storage Methods [2-4]	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.4	3.5
Cleanliness of House [5-10]	8.8	9.0	9.6	10.0	9.5	10.0	8.6	9.0
Overall Adequacy*** [17-34]	27.5	27.0	29.0	28.5	29.8	30.0	27.4	27.0

*Respondents are classified according to the type of casework service they were receiving as of the June 1968 survey.

**The numbers in brackets presented along with each of the conditions identified above represent the minimum and maximum scores attainable for that section of the survey.

***Initial and follow-up estimates of "Overall Adequacy" were obtained by summating scores for "Residential Safety", "Adequacy of Waste Disposal", "Adequacy of Water Supply", "Adequacy of Food Storage Methods" and "Cleanliness of House".

TABLE 60: SUMMARY OF NONPARAMETRIC TEST* RESULTS: SIGNIFICANCE OF CHANGE SHOWN BY HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS BETWEEN FEBRUARY 1968 AND JUNE 1968 IN ADEQUACY OF SANITATION AND SAFETY CONDITIONS

SANITATION AND SAFETY CONDITION RATED	RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION			
	Homemaking Family (n=23)	Case Aide Family (n=12)	Social Work Family (n=8)	Homemaking Multiproblem Family (n=12)
Residential Safety	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =.06$†
Adequacy of Waste Disposal	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$ NS
Adequacy of Water Supply	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$ NS
Adequacy of Food Storage Methods	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$ NS
Cleanliness of House	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =$ NS
Overall Adequacy**	$\rho =$NS	$\rho =.06$†	$\rho =.06$†	$\rho =.09$†

*The Binomial Test was used to evaluate significance of change in Sanitation and Safety conditions for the Case Aide, Social Worker, and Social Worker Multiproblem families whereas the test used to evaluate significance of change shown by Homemaker families was the McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes (Siegal, 1956).

**Initial and follow-up estimates of "Overall Adequacy" were obtained by summating scores for "Residential Safety", "Adequacy of Waste Disposal", "Adequacy of Water Supply", "Adequacy of Food Storage Methods" and "Cleanliness of House".

†Change was in the direction of improvement.

Comparisons Between Homemaking and Non-Homemaking Groups on the Initial and Follow-up Surveys

It was noted in the beginning of the Results section that as a second approach to the evaluation of Hypothesis 4, the four classification groups of Project families would be collapsed into two groups for the purpose of performing between-groups comparisons separately for the initial and final Household Conditions Rating Survey data. This method was suggested by the findings reported in Table 49 (p. 74), that is, distinctions between the four classification groups in terms of the type of Project services received were not clear-cut. Data on the number and type of Project services received by the four groups (Table 49) suggested that families could be more clearly distinguished in terms of the major type of Project services received if they were categorized according to whether they were assigned a Homemaker or simply received the routine social casework services extended to all Project families.

Housing. A total of 66 families were rated on the initial survey in February, 1968. Median Tests (Siegel, 1956) were performed for each of the sub-areas of the Housing section of the Household Conditions Rating Survey comparing families receiving Homemaking services (i.e., Homemaking and Homemaking Multiproblem) with families receiving mainly social casework services (i.e., Social Work and Case Aide). These comparisons indicate that Homemaking families (n=43) and Non-Homemaking families (n=23) did not differ initially on any of the ratings concerning adequacy of housing.

Median Tests were also performed comparing the ratings of Homemaking (n=35) and Non-Homemaking (n=20) families who participated in the June, 1968 survey. These analyses indicate that the two groups did not differ in terms of rated adequacy of housing.

Nutrition. Data was available on a total of 65 families for a comparison between Homemaking (n=42) and Non-Homemaking (n=23) families in terms of initial survey ratings of nutritional adequacy. Median Test comparisons indicated that the two groups were initially comparable in nutritional status.

Comparisons between Homemaking (n=35) and Non-Homemaking (n=20) families who participated in the follow-up survey reveal that again the two groups did not differ significantly on any of the measures.

Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene. Ratings on the initial survey were available for a total of 66 adults and 66 children. Median Test comparisons between Homemaking (n=43) and Non-Homemaking (n=23) parents and between Homemaking (n=43) and Non-Homemaking (n=23) children produced no significant differences between parent or child groups.

Similar tests of significance were performed on ratings of the 55 parents and 55 children present for the follow-up survey. No significant differences in Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene were found between the Homemaking (n=35) and Non-Homemaking (n=20) parent and child groups.

Safety and Sanitation. Median Test comparisons between Homemaking (n=43) and Non-Homemaking (n=23) families who participated in the initial survey show that the two groups were comparable in Safety and Sanitation ratings.

Results of Median Tests performed on Safety and Sanitation ratings obtained by Homemaking (n=35) and Non-Homemaking (n=20) families on the follow-up survey indicate that, as before, the two groups did not differ significantly from each other on any of the measures employed.

General Conclusions

The general lack of significant changes in household conditions as a function of exposure to Project social services is not surprising when it is recalled that the initial ratings were obtained in most cases well after the initiation of social services and that the four groups of Project families classified according to the major type of social service received tended to overlap to a great extent in the kind and number of services actually received.

A major problem encountered in this investigation was the basic misunderstanding of the nature of Homemaking services. That is, the design for Hypothesis 4 was based upon the assumption that the focus of Homemaking services is specific with respect to effecting improvement in Housing, Nutrition, Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene and in Safety and Sanitation. Late in the fiscal year it was learned that in actual practice, the objectives of Homemaking services are essentially non-specific and carried out in a non-directive manner. Therefore, in retrospect, it would seem that the evaluation of Hypothesis 4 could have been accomplished more effectively if the analysis of change in families had been non-specific, i.e., individual families receiving Project services should have been rated in terms of the amount and kind of change shown in those areas in which they specifically chose to work with a Homemaker or Social Worker. Further, it would have been more appropriate to investigate the effects of Project social services in terms of the total number of visits paid to a family by Project personnel rather than to distinguish "treatment" groups in terms of the major type of social service for which families were formally designated.

Bearing these major problems in mind, it may be concluded that the prediction that Homemaking families would show improvement in all areas sampled by the Household Conditions Rating Survey (Housing, Nutrition, Personal Cleanliness and Hygiene, and Safety and Sanitation) was not confirmed. In fact, families in the Homemaker group did not show significant improvement (or change of any kind) on any of the measures employed. Some confirmation of the prediction that Homemaker Multiproblem families would show improvement was obtained, specifically in terms of their change in Overall Adequacy ratings on the Housing and Safety and Sanitation sections, and in the specific sub-area of Residential Safety.

The fact that the Case Aide families showed significant improvement in the consumption of Other Foodstuffs and the finding that both Case Aide and Social Work families improved significantly in Overall Adequacy of Safety and Sanitation is surprising in view of the kind and amount of social services these families received compared to Homemaking and Homemaking Multiproblem families. However, this finding may have occurred because families who receive only routine social casework services are functioning at a more adequate level and are able to make significant improvements with a minimum of intervention. It is interesting that families serviced by Case Aides made more significant improvements than families serviced by "more educated and experienced" Social Workers. What this finding actually indicates is difficult to assess; it may be that it is due to the effectiveness of the training program given the Case Aides, to the greater time spent with families by Case Aides than Social Workers, or to a tendency to assign Case Aides to the most adequate families in the Project.

The failure to obtain significant differences between Homemaking and Non-Homemaking families on any of the Household Conditions Rating Survey measures for the initial or final survey suggests that the same type of Project services are given to all families, despite their formal designations. This lack of difference between Homemaking and Non-Homemaking groups may also reflect the fact that the type and intensity of Project service given families is confounded with the adequacy level of the families within the two groups. That is, it is inappropriate to compare the least adequate families who receive the most intensive services to the most adequate families receiving less intensive services.

In summary, it is concluded that Hypothesis 4 is partially supported only by data obtained from Homemaking Multiproblem families. It is clearly not supported by data obtained from Homemaking families, and the assumptions underlying the hypothesis are called into question by the results obtained with the Case Aide and Social Work families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It would appear from the preceding section that areas other than household conditions should be examined for evidence of improvement as a function of receiving Rural Child Care Project social services. Since the roles of Social Workers, Case Aides, and Homemakers are essentially non-directive with respect to the particular type of improvement sought with each family receiving Project social services, it is undoubtedly inappropriate to look for changes to occur in all Project families within the same specific areas such as those examined in this study. However, due to certain general objectives the Project staff attempts to accomplish with each family, it is reasonable to assume that families would show improvement in the following general areas: medical problems, contact with community agencies, concern for their children's welfare and future, ability to communicate, and general morale.

It has been proposed for the 1968-1969 research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project that the general effects of homemaking services be assessed in terms of changes in morale of Project parents (p. 9):

> "Hypothesis 7: Parents newly affiliated with the Project who have received homemaking services for a minimal period of four and one-half months and whose children have attended the Child Development Centers for a minimal period of sixty (60) days during this interim will show a significantly greater improvement in their morale than will newly affiliated parents whose participation in the Project is limited to their children's participation in the Child Development Program alone. However, the latter group as well as the former is expected to exhibit some improvement."

The proposal states the rationale underlying Hypothesis 7 as follows (p. 12):

> "Project parents deemed in need of Project homemaking services are generally both more impoverished and more socially disorganized than Project parents not considered to be in need of such services. Thus one would expect morale to initially be lower among the former than among the latter group of parents. However, after supportive services have been provided to those parents considered to be in need of them for some period of time, presumably their morale will not differ significantly from that of Project parents who did not receive (or need) such services. In other words, although both groups of parents are expected to show a significant improvement in their outlook on life after their children have attended the Child Development Centers for at least sixty (60) days, the improvement shown should be greatest among those parents who in addition received supportive services in the interim."

It is also recommended that future investigations of changes in family functioning related to Project participation incorporate measures of change which are specific with respect to the individual family. That is, the progress of a family should be the focus of an evaluation of the relationship between intervention and changes in family adequacy. The major obstacles to such an approach are the great difficulties in devising meaningful criteria and in training the non-professional staff to perform objective ratings ("pre" and "post") of families they service.

Finally, it is anticipated that closer communication between the Project Staff and the Research Division in the future will prevent the recurrence of an inappropriately conceived design for the evaluation of a basic component of the Rural Child Care Project program.

IV. Child Rearing Attitudes of Project Parents

Hypothesis 5 states that,

> "Parents of children who have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days will change in their attitudes toward various child-rearing practices. Specifically, these parents will become less punitive, more supportive and more consistent in their attitudes toward children."

METHOD

The general method consisted of obtaining initial and follow-up measures of parents' attitudes toward 1) the use of fear as a technique of child control (i.e., "punitiveness") and 2) children's rights and liberties (i.e., "supportiveness"). Initial attitude measures were obtained during the period from November 29 to December 13, 1967, and follow-up sessions were held during May, 1968. For all respondents who were interviewed twice, the minimal time elapsed between initial and follow-up measures was 153 days while the maximum was 173 days.

Subjects

In the early fall of 1967 a list was compiled of all parents or parent-surrogates who had been admitted to the Project since June, 1967, and whose children, at the time, had attended the Child Development Centers for a period of 50 days or less. The number of potential subjects thus identified was only 219.* Because it was anticipated that possibly as few as one-fourth of these individuals would be both willing and available to participate in the interviews, the attendance cut-off criterion was raised to 75 days or less and a new list was compiled.** An additional 128 potential subjects were obtained using this procedure, yielding a total of 347 parents or parent-surrogates who comprised the initial attitude target sample.

Altogether 109 respondents (or about one-third of the potential respondents) appeared for the attitude interviews (see Table 61).

Of the 109 subjects who participated in the initial interviews, it was learned that 37, or almost one-third, were, in fact, ineligible as subjects on the basis of the Child Development Center attendance cut-off criterion of 75 days which had been established for children of persons in the attitude target sample. The reason for this was that, unknown to the Research Staff at the time the subject list was compiled, these parents had one (or more) of their children enrolled in the Rural Child Care Project in 1965 and/or in 1966. These children were subsequently withdrawn from the Child Development Center but beginning in June, 1967, the parents had enrolled one or more of their younger children in the program. Although the latter group of children (i.e., the children who had been enrolled since June, 1967) had indeed attended a Child Development Center no more than 75 days at the time the target group list was compiled, when the number of days of attendance at a Child Development Center by this group was combined with the attendance of their older siblings who had been enrolled in the program in 1965 or in 1966, the attendance criterion was exceeded in every case. The Research Staff was unaware that these parents had children enrolled in the Child Development Program prior to June, 1967, for the reason that the intake dates which had been submitted to the Research Staff by the Project Staff for these 37 parents were incorrect, reflecting not the date of the family's original date of the admission to the Project, as they were supposed to do, but, instead the day of their readmission to the Project. This error was discovered after the attitude interviewing had already taken place. Thus, at the time of the initial attitude interviews, the children of these 37 respondents had actually attended a Child Development Center an average of 224 days.

---

*This number includes mothers and fathers, as well as male and female parent-surrogates.

**It had been the experience of the Research Staff that only about one out of three potential respondents actually appeared for interviews.

TABLE 61: FREQUENCY AND PER CENT OF PROJECT PARENTS INCLUDED IN INITIAL CHILD REARING ATTITUDES INTERVIEW BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

County	Frequency	Per Cent
Elliott	13	11.9%
Floyd	8	7.3
Harlan	22	20.2
Knott	14	12.8
Lee	11	10.1
Letcher	7	6.4
Magoffin	10	9.2
Morgan	8	7.3
Owsley	6	5.5
Wolfe	10	9.2
TOTAL	109	99.9%

The remaining 72 respondents who were eligible for attitude interviewing on the basis of the attendance cut-off criterion had children who had attended the Child Development Centers an average of only 53 days when the initial interviews took place.

Upon examination of both the eligible respondents' and ineligible respondents' scores, it was determined, first of all, that neither of the two groups had very strong attitudes toward either issue, and second, that the 72 eligible respondents did not appear to differ significantly on either issue from the 37 ineligible respondents. For these reasons, all 109 respondents were scheduled to be interviewed the second time during the latter part of April, 1968. Of these 109 respondents, 75 were seen in the follow-up attitude measurement session.*

In terms of the final group's race and sex composition, all but nine of the 75 respondents were white and all but 13 were females. Fifty-five of the respondents were interviewed as the sole representatives of their respective families (i.e., either the male or female heads but not both were interviewed twice) while the remaining 20 respondents were comprised of ten couples (i.e., initial and follow-up measures were obtained on both the male and female head of ten families). Table 62 presents a breakdown of the total group on the basis of respondents' counties of residence.

Only three of the 75 respondents who participated in both the initial and follow-up sessions withdrew their child(ren) from the Project's Child Development Program during the interim between the initial and follow-up interviews. The data collected on these subjects were not used in the final analyses. The children of the remaining 72 respondents were still enrolled in the Program and were still attending one of the Child Development Centers at the time the final attitude measures were obtained. That the sample as a whole is quite heterogeneous with respect to their children's Child Development Center attendance becomes evident upon inspection of Table 63.**

---

*Approximately one-third of the parents who failed to appear for their follow-up attitude interview did so because they had moved out of the area during the interval between the initial and follow-up sessions. A variety of reasons accounted for the failure of the remaining parents to appear for their follow-up interviews.

**A substantial proportion of this heterogeneity can be attributed to the fact that 32 of the 75 respondents were mistakenly thought to be recent Project admissions (after May 31, 1967) and were interviewed as such. The error was not discovered until the end of the second quarter of the fiscal year and by that time it was too late to recruit more subjects for Hypothesis 5.

TABLE 62: FREQUENCY AND PER CENT OF PROJECT PARENTS INTERVIEWED TWICE ("TOTAL GROUP") ON CHILD REARING ATTITUDES BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

County	Frequency	Per Cent
Elliott	11	14.7%
Floyd	3	4.0
Harlan	19	25.3
Knott	8	10.7
Lee	10	13.3
Letcher	2	2.7
Magoffin	6	8.0
Morgan	8	10.7
Owsley	2	2.7
Wolfe	6	8.0
TOTAL	75	100.1%

TABLE 63: CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT PARENTS INTERVIEWED TWICE ON THEIR CHILD REARING ATTITUDES (TOTAL GROUP) ON THE BASIS OF THEIR CHILDREN'S CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (CDC) ATTENDANCE

Respondent's Classification	Frequency	Per Cent
Children Withdrawn From Child Development Program Prior To Follow-up Attitude Session	3	4.0%
Children's CDC Prior Attendance=30 Days Or Less; CDC Interim Attendance=60 Days Or More	6	8.0
Children's CDC Prior Attendance=30 Days Or Less; CDC Interim Attendance=59 Days Or Less	2	2.7
Children's CDC Prior Attendance=31-99 Days; CDC Interim Attendance=60 Days Or More	35	46.7
Children's CDC Prior Attendance=31-99 Days; CDC Interim Attendance=59 Days Or Less	2	2.7
Children's CDC Prior Attendance=100 Days Or More; CDC Interim Attendance=60 Days Or More	25	33.3
Children's CDC Prior Attendance=100 Days Or More; CDC Interim Attendance=59 Days Or Less	2	2.7
Total Group	75	100.1%

For purposes of analysis, criteria were established for a control group (or comparison group) and an experimental group. The control or "Early Admissions" group consisted of subjects whose children had attended a Child Development Center more than 75 days at the time of the initial interview and who were still active during the interim between the first and second attitude measurement sessions. In addition, these respondents were admitted to the Project for the first time prior to June 1, 1967. The experimental or "Recent Admissions" group was made up of subjects whose children had attended a Child Development Center no more than 75 days at the time of the initial interview and who were still active during the interim between the first and second attitude interviews. These respondents were admitted to the Project for the first time after May 31, 1967. Of the remaining 72 respondents who had been interviewed twice, 29 met the criteria for the control group and 29 met the criteria for the experimental group. Data for the other

14 subjects who did not meet the criteria for either group were discarded.* Accordingly, 58 respondents were used in the final analyses.

Nineteen of the 75 respondents who participated in both the initial and follow-up interviews also participated in both sessions of the Household Rating Scale. In eight of the 19 instances, both male and female heads of the household were interviewed (i.e., four couples) on their child rearing attitudes.

Materials

The "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear To Control Children's Behavior Scale" was used during both initial and follow-up sessions to measure punitiveness and the "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale" was used to measure permissiveness. By correlating the scales, it was possible to measure consistency of attitudes toward permissiveness and punitiveness. Copies of these scales are presented in Appendices F and G.

Both of the attitude scales referred to above were constructed by the Research Staff in accordance with Thurstone's (1929; 1931a; 1931b) method of Equal-Appearing Intervals.** Although other scales were available which would have been appropriate for testing Hypothesis 5 insofar as the attitudes to which they pertain are concerned, the terminology in which the attitude items are expressed is quite complex in comparison to the simple vocabulary which is customary among the disadvantaged individuals who comprised the sample in this study. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to construct new scales containing items expressed in simplified language.

Briefly, the following steps were involved in the construction of the "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear To Control Children's Behavior Scale" ("Fear" scale) and the "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale" ("Freedom" scale): (1) Early in the first quarter of the reporting period, 199 simplified items which reflect varying degrees and types of feeling about the use of fear as a means of controlling the behavior of children and 105 items concerning children's rights and liberties were formulated by members of the Research Staff. These items are presented in Appendices H and I. (2) Judgements of the favorability expressed in the pool of 199 "Fear" scale items and the pool of 105 "Freedom" scale items were obtained in separate sessions from a total of 109 resident non-professional staff members employed by the Rural Child Care Project in ten counties. (3) On the basis of these judgments, scale and Q values were computed for each item.* (4) For each scale, 22 items which were spread more or less evenly along the attitude continuum were selected from the item pool for inclusion in the scale. (5) Finally, items were arranged in randomized order to form the final Fear and Freedom scales (see Appendices F and G). Permission to use these instruments was received from the Head Start Office of Research and Evaluation during the latter part of November, 1967.

---

*These 14 subjects were those who were admitted to the Project prior to June, 1967, but whose children had attended a Child Development Center less than 75 days prior to the first interview. Everyone in this group was active in the Project during the interim between first and second interviews.

**For a detailed description of the methods employed in scale construction, see the October 1, 1967, Rural Child Care Project Quarterly Research Progress Report.

In order to score either scale, the respondent was first asked to indicate his agreement or disagreement with each item of the scale. His score on the "Fear" scale was then taken as the median of the scale values of all the items in the "Fear" scale with which he indicated agreement. A high score on this scale (between 6 and 10) is indicative of an unfavorable attitude toward the utilization of fear as a disciplinary technique. A score of 6.00 would indicate a more or less neutral attitude on this issue. A score of below 6 indicates a favorable attitude toward the use of fear in controlling children's behavior. Similarly, the respondent's score on the "Rights and Liberties" scale was taken as the median of the scale values of all the items in the "Rights and Liberties" scale for which agreement had been indicated. A low score on this scale (i.e., less than 6) is taken to be indicative of permissiveness. A score of 6.00 would again indicate a more or less neutral attitude, and a score between 6 and 10 would indicate a more restrictive attitude toward children's rights and liberties.

Procedure

During all attitude measurement sessions, both the "Fear" and the "Rights and Liberties" scales were administered orally to each respondent by a member of the Research Staff. The interview site varied from county to county, consisting in some counties of the Project Social Worker's office and in others of the nearest Child Development Center. A few respondents who were unable to travel to the prearranged interview site were interviewed in their homes. In all cases, the interview sessions were private with the respondent and the interviewer being the only adults present during the interview.*

---

*In judging Fear scale items, 62 of the 109 staff members failed to follow instructions (see Appendix J) and their judgments had to be discarded from the computation of scale and Q values. Although judgments of Freedom scale items were obtained from 107 staff members, 58 failed to follow instructions (see Appendix K) and hence their judgments were also discarded.

During each session the interviewer first presented the instructions to the respondent (see Appendices F and G respectively for the instructions used to introduce the "Fear" and the "Rights and Liberties" scales) and then read each attitude item to him. Immediately after the presentation of an item, the respondent was asked to indicate his agreement with the feeling expressed in it. In the event that the respondent was reluctant to express his agreement or disagreement with a given item, the item was repeated and he was again encouraged to express his agreement or disagreement with it.

For 38 of the 75 respondents on whom initial and follow-up measures were secured, the administration of the "Fear" scale preceded the administration of the "Rights and Liberties" scale during both the initial and the follow-up sessions. For the remaining 37 respondents the order of scale administration during the initial and follow-up sessions was reversed.

RESULTS

Validity of the Attitude Scales

Theoretically, for an attitude scale constructed in accordance with the Thurstone Method of Equal-Appearing Intervals, a respondent should agree with only those items which are compatible with his true position on the attitude continuum, and if a substantial proportion of a group of respondents express agreement with items whose scale values are widely separated on the attitude continuum, multidimensionality of the scale is indicated. In effect, multidimensionality means that more than one attitude is being measured by the scale, and unless the contributions made to the total score by the various attitudes which the scale actually measures are known and separable, the attitude score is not really meaningful (Shaw and Wright, 1967).

With the foregoing considerations in mind, the range of scale values for the "Fear" and the "Rights and Liberties" scale items with which agreement had been indicated was separately computed for each of the 75 respondents who comprised the total sample for evaluating Hypothesis 5. During the initial and follow-up administrations of both attitude scales, all respondents expressed agreement with two or more mutually incompatible attitude items (i.e., items whose scale values are located at opposite ends of the attitude continuum), indicating multidimensionality of both scales.* This raises serious questions concerning the validity of both scales and consequently the validity of the procedures employed to test Hypothesis 5.

---

*Some of the female respondents who found it necessary to bring their children with them to the interview site insisted on having them present during their interview. In no case, however, was any adult present during the interview other than the respondent and the interviewer.

Order of Scale Administration

"Order of Scale Administration" was not used as a variable in any of the analyses reported in this section. A preliminary analysis indicated that it had a negligible (i.e., nonsignificant) effect on both sets of initial scores and on follow-up "Fear" scores. However, subjects who were interviewed for the "Rights and Liberties" scale prior to being interviewed for the "Fear" scale scored significantly lower (CR=2.52; $\rho < .05$) on the former during the follow-up sessions than did subjects who were interviewed in the reverse order.

Relationship Between Parental Attitudes and Children's Child Development Center Attendance

Based on the total group of respondents from whom initial and follow-up attitude measures were secured (n=75) Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed for the following pairs of measures: (1) Parents' initial scores on the "Rights and Liberties" scale correlated 0.18 with their children's Child Development Center attendance occurring prior to the initial attitude measurement sessions ("Prior CDC Attendance"); and (2) initial scores on the "Fear" scale correlated -0.08 with prior CDC attendance. (3) Parents' follow-up scores on the "Rights and Liberties" scale correlated 0.09 with their children's Child Development Center attendance which occurred in the interim between the initial and follow-up attitude measurement sessions ("Interim CDC Attendance"); and (4) follow-up scores on the "Fear" scale correlated -0.02 with interim CDC attendance. In no case did the obtained correlations attain the .05 level of significance.

Respondents who had been admitted to the Project for the first time prior to June 1, 1967, and whose children had a prior CDC attendance of more than 75 days (Control or Early Admissions Group; n=29) were compared on initial attitude scores with respondents who had been admitted to the Project for the first time after May 31, 1967, and whose children had prior CDC attendance of no more than 75 days (Experimental or Recent Admissions Group; n=29): (1) Children of respondents in the Early Admissions Group had a mean prior CDC attendance of 225.6 days (σ =95.9; range=84-422) while the mean prior attendance for children of respondents in the Recent Admissions Group was 44.6 days (σ =17.3; range=2-74). (2) The mean initial scores on the "Rights and Liberties" scale for the Early Admissions and Recent Admissions Groups were 6.27 and 5.83 respectively. The results of a Critical Ratio test revealed no significant difference between these means (CR=1.33; $\rho > .10$). (3) The Critical Ratio test for initial scores on the "Fear" scale also revealed no significant difference (CR=0.39; $\rho > .10$) between the Early Admissions and the Recent Admissions Groups (mean initial score=5.54 and 5.49 respectively).

---

*An alternate indication could be that these respondents did not endorse or reject items on the basis of item content but according to a response set, e.g., "social desirability" or "acquiescence".

Relationship Between Attitudes Toward Utilizing Fear To Control Children And Attitudes Toward Children's Rights And Liberties

Hypothesis 5 states in part that parents will become more consistent in their attitudes toward child-rearing practices after their children have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days. Because of the difficulties encountered in the selection of respondents for Hypothesis 5 and because of the lack of unidimensionality of the attitude scales used, no meaningful test of this hypothesis was possible.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed to determine for the total sample (n=75) interviewed twice the relationship between the Fear and Freedom scales on the first and second interview and the test-retest reliabilities for each scale. According to the original assumption that both scales were unidimensional, it was expected that there would be a negative correlation between the scores obtained on each scale. The degree to which respondents were consistent in their child rearing attitudes was predicted to be evidenced in a higher negative correlation between the two scale scores on the final interview than on the initial interview. The obtained correlation coefficients between the two scales were -.23 ($\rho < .05$) and -.17 (ρ =ns) on initial and final interviews, respectively. Despite the fact that the obtained correlations are negative, as predicted, there is no increase in the magnitude of this relationship from first to second interview and the magnitude of the correlations is small, a reflection of the tendency of all respondents to endorse items at both ends of the attitude continuum. The test-retest correlation coefficients were .41 ($\rho < .01$) (Fear scale) and .59 ($\rho < .01$) (Freedom scale). Again, these coefficients reflect a tendency of respondents to be inconsistent in their endorsements of scale items on both administrations.

The general conclusion is that Hypothesis 5 is not supported by the findings of the present study. However, due to the considerable methodological problems encountered in sample selection and the inconsistency of attitude endorsements on the two scales, it is reasonable to conclude that the present study does not constitute a fair test of Hypothesis 5.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While it is anticipated that future studies involving Rural Child Care Project parents will encounter fewer difficulties in obtaining accurate information regarding Project participation and other case history data related to sample selection criteria, it is not likely that instruments similar to the "Fear" and "Freedom" scales will be utilized again due to problems of validity (and possibly of response set) which became apparent in the current study. The problem of determining attitude change in Project parents as a function of their children's participation in the Child Development Program remains as a challenge for further evaluations of the Rural Child Care Project. It may be that direct observation of parental behaviors and open-ended, "concrete" interviews will prove more effective in obtaining meaningful data on this question. Such an approach is recommended for the 1969-1970 evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project since, at the time this report was written, it was too late to include such an approach in the 1968-1969 research evaluation proposal.

V. Attitudes Toward Education of Rural Child Care Project Parents

Hypothesis 6 states that,

> "Parents of children who have attended a Child Development Center for a minimal period of sixty days will show a change in their attitudes toward education. Specifically, these parents will become more favorable in their attitudes toward the value of a high school education."

METHOD

The general method was to interview parents of children enrolled in the Project's Child Development Program twice concerning their attitudes toward the value of a high school education. Initial interviews were held during two time periods - from November 1 to November 16, 1967, and from January 31 to February 8, 1968. Respondents were interviewed for a second time during May or during the latter part of June, 1968. The minimal time elapsed between the initial and follow-up interviews was 139 days while the maximum was 228 days.

Subjects

A list was compiled during the first quarter of the reporting period of parents who had entered the Project since June, 1967, and whose children had attended the Child Development Centers no more than 50 days as of October, 1968. Altogether the children of 219 parents or parent-surrogates were able to meet the attendance criterion of 50 days and thus these parents constituted the attitude target sample for Hypothesis 6.

Of the 219 persons whose names appeared on the target sample list, 69 (31.5%) were available and willing to be interviewed regarding their attitudes toward education. In addition, four parents whose names were not on the list of potential respondents appeared and were interviewed.* Altogether initial attitude measures were obtained from 73 parents during November. However, the data for one respondent were incomplete and hence had to be discarded.

As was the case with Hypothesis 5, it was discovered following the initial administration of the Education Scale that a substantial number of the persons interviewed were actually ineligible as attitude respondents on the basis of the attendance cut-off criterion. Thus the children of 21 (almost one-third) of the 73 parents interviewed exceeded the attendance criterion. At the time the interviews took place, these parents were believed to constitute recent admissions to the Project. However, after the interviewing, it was discovered that the intake dates which had been submitted for these parents were incorrect and that, instead of being recent admissions, these respondents had had one (or more) of their children enrolled in the Project Child Development Program in 1965 and/or in 1966 and that they had subsequently enrolled a second or third child in the program in 1967. When the attendance of the children currently enrolled in the program was combined with that of their older siblings who had been in the program in 1965 and/or 1966, it was discovered that the attendance cut-off criterion of 50 days was exceeded in each and every case. The children of these 21 respondents had actually attended an average of almost 241 days at the time when the initial attitude interviews took place, whereas the children of the 52 parents who were eligible as attitude respondents on the basis of the attendance cut-off criterion had attended the Child Development Centers an average of only 38 days at the time of the initial attitude interviews.

---

*It was subsequently discovered that the children of two of these parents met the attendance cut-off criterion and consequently these two parents are included in the group of eligible attitude respondents. The children of the other two parents did not meet the attendance cut-off criterion and thus their parents are included in the group of ineligible attitude respondents.

The 51 eligible respondents on whom complete attitude measures were obtained were considered to be an inadequate sample for the statistical assessment of Hypothesis 6. Consequently, 11 additional Project parents were interviewed on the Education Scale during the period from January 31 to February 8, 1968, thus bringing the total of eligible attitude respondents for Hypothesis 6 to 62 and the total of all respondents interviewed to 84 (see Table 64).*

TABLE 64: FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF PROJECT PARENTS INITIALLY INTERVIEWED ON THE EDUCATION SCALE BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

County	Frequency	Per Cent
Elliott	13*	16.7%
Floyd	5	6.0
Harlan	15	17.8
Knott	9	10.7
Lee	10	11.9
Letcher	6	7.1
Magoffin	3	3.6
Morgan	5	6.0
Owsley	15	17.8
Wolfe	2	2.4
TOTALS	83	100.0%

---

*Data for one respondent were incomplete and had to be discarded.

The readministration of the Education Scale to the 21 ineligible and the 62 eligible respondents was conducted during May and June of 1968. In every case the minimal period elapsing between the initial administration of the Education Scale and its readministration was four and one-half months.

Of the 83 potential respondents for readministration of the Education Scale, only 61 could be contacted.* Altogether these 61 respondents constitute the sample for evaluating Hypothesis 6 and will henceforth be referred to as the "Total Group".

In terms of their children's Child Development Center attendance, the Total Group was fairly heterogeneous** since 12 respondents had children who had attended a Center 30 days or less at the time of the initial attitude interview, 36 had children who had attended between 31 and 89 days, and 13 had children who had attended more than 100 days prior to the initial interviews. In terms of race-sex composition, the group was less heterogeneous since only six of the subjects were non-white and only eight were male. Forty-nine of the 61 respondents were interviewed as the sole representatives of their families (i.e., the male or female head was interviewed, but not both) while in the remaining 12 cases both the male and female heads were interviewed (i.e., six couples). A breakdown of the Total Group by the respondents' counties of residence is presented in Table 65.

TABLE 65: FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF PROJECT PARENTS INTERVIEWED TWICE ON THE EDUCATION SCALE BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

County	Frequency	Per Cent
Elliott	11	18.0%
Floyd	4	6.6
Harlan	12	19.7
Knott	6	9.8
Lee	9	14.8
Letcher	3	4.9
Magoffin	3	4.9
Morgan	5	8.2
Owsley	6	9.8
Wolfe	2	3.3
TOTALS	61	100.0%

---

*Most of the 22 subjects who did not participate in the follow-up interviews had either moved out of the county during the interval between the initial and follow-up interviews or else they were working and could not be contacted.

**The Total Group was also heterogeneous with respect to age. However no attempt was made to learn any respondent's age since it was felt that this might be perceived as threatening.

Materials

Permission was secured from the Head Start Office of Research and Evaluation to use the Education Scale, a Likert-type scale which was developed by Rundquist and Sletto (1936), to measure attitudes during both the initial and follow-up sessions. This scale is presented in Appendix L along with the instructions which were used to introduce it. Appendix M presents simplified alternate phrasing for each item of the original scale. In general, alternate phrasing was used only after a respondent indicated that he could not comprehend an item as stated in its original form. These alternate phrasings were written by the Research Staff.

Procedure

For both the initial and follow-up interviews, the Education Scale was administered orally to the respondent by a member of the Research Staff utilizing standardized interview techniques. The interview site was a local church, a Project Child Development Center, or the county Social Worker's office although a few respondents who were unable to travel to the prearranged interview site were interviewed in their homes. In all cases, interview sessions were private with the respondent and the interviewer being the only adults present during the interview.* During each session the interviewer presented each attitude item as stated in its original form and then asked the respondent to indicate the extent of his agreement or disagreement with it. In the event that a respondent could not comprehend an item as stated in its original form, the interviewer then presented it in a simplified form (see Appendix M).

Scoring of the Education Scale was accomplished in the following manner: on all items expressing a positive attitude toward the value of a high school education, a response of "Strongly Agree" was scored 5 points, "Agree" was scored 4 points, "Undecided" was scored 3 points, "Disagree" was scored 2 points and "Strongly Disagree" was scored 1 point. The assigning of scores was reversed for items expressing a negative attitude, e.g., "Strongly Disagree" was scored 5 points. Thus for each item a respondent could receive from 1 to 5 points. On the total scale, scores range from a "maximally negative" attitude (22 points) to a "maximally positive" attitude (110 points). Persons who are uncertain regarding their attitudes toward the value of a high school education would be expected to score approximately 66 points or the intermediate value between 22 and 110.

---

*Many of the female respondents brought young children with them to the interview site and some of them insisted on having their children present during the interviews. In no case, however, was any adult present during the interview other than the respondent and the interviewer.

RESULTS

Initial Attitude Measures

As an indirect test of Hypothesis 6, the initial attitude measures (total score on the Education Scale) of the 12 respondents whose children had attended a Center 30 days or less at the time of the initial interviews (mean prior attendance=16.8 days) were compared with those of the 13 respondents whose children had attended a Center more than 100 days prior to the initial interviews (mean prior attendance=269.7 days). The mean initial attitude total scores of these two subgroups were 92.17 (σ=7.20; range=78-106) and 93.23 (σ=5.39; range=85-105) respectively. The test of statistical significance used was the Mann-Whitney U Test (Siegal, 1956). The results of this test revealed no significant difference between the two subgroups in terms of their initial attitude scores (U=78; ρ>.05).

Attitude Change.

The 14 respondents whose children had attended 40 days or less prior to the parent's initial attitude interviews and at least 75 days in the interim between the initial and follow-up interviews had a mean initial attitude score of 92.86 (σ=5.73; range=83-106) and a mean follow-up score of 97.78 (σ=6.73; range=83-108). The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Tests (Siegal, 1956) was used to assess the significance of attitude change occurring among the 13 respondents whose children had attended at least 145 days prior to their parents' initial attitude interviews. These respondents had a mean initial attitude score of 93.23 (σ=5.39; range=85-105) and a mean follow-up score of 98.92 (σ=6.29; range=85-107). The results of these two tests indicate that both of these subgroups showed a significant improvement (ρ=.01 and .02 respectively) in their attitudes toward the value of a high school education.

Other Findings

As a third and final test of Hypothesis 6, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (r_s) was used to measure the relationship between respondents' attitude scores and their children's Child Development Center attendance. Initial attitude measures obtained from the 61 respondents comprising the total group correlated .01 with Child Development Center attendance occurring prior to the initial interviews (t=.08; ρ>.20) and attitude change scores for these respondents correlated .15 with Child Development Center attendance occurring during the interval between the initial and follow-up sessions (t=1.16; ρ>.20).

Thus, it does not appear there is any significant relationship between children's Child Development Center attendance and Project parents' attitudes towards education.

In conclusion, Hypothesis 6 is only partially confirmed. That is, the present sample of Project parents indicated positive change in their attitudes toward the value of a high school education over a four to six month period. This change is all the more noteworthy when their initial highly positive attitude toward education is considered (on the average, Project parents in the sample scored in the low 90's initially). However, there does not appear to be a direct relationship between this observed change in attitude and the amount of Child Development Center attendance of their children prior to the initial administration of the Education Scale or during the interim between the first and second administrations of the Education Scale. A criticism of this study is the lack of a comparison group of parents whose children did not have any contact with the Child Development Center Program during the same time period. However, the impossibility of obtaining the cooperation of such a group has ruled out such a comparison in all studies to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Further study of the attitudes toward education held by Project parents should focus upon the degree to which their attitudes are related to subsequent school achievement of their children after they enter public school. Because of the difficulty in securing data from a disadvantaged parent group not participating in the Project, a promising method to employ in future research is a within-groups comparison.

The present study has indicated that Project parents tend to value a high school education highly. However, their tendency to increase this positive attitude after four to six months is not related to the amount of their children's attendance at a Child Development Center. Thus it might be asked whether such a change in attitude toward education is related in any specific way to subsequent school achievement of their children. More specifically, it is of concern to determine if Project parents differ with respect to their educational attitudes that promote or discourage academic achievement in their children.

Using as a model the comprehensive study of familial determinants of over and under achievement done by Strodtbeck (1959), the following hypotheses have been proposed for the 1968-1969 research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project (p. 8):

> "Hypothesis 6: The extent to which the disadvantaged child utilizes his capacity for achievement in the schools will be related to the basic value orientation of his parents."
>
> "6a: Parents of high achieving children (i.e., 'overachievers') will endorse the belief that the world is orderly and amenable to rational mastery and that therefore a person should make plans which will control his destiny. Parents of low achieving children (i.e., 'underachievers') will endorse the contrary belief."

> "6b: Parents of high achieving children will express agreement with the idea that a young person should be willing to leave home to make his way in life. Parents of low achieving children, however, will express disagreement with this idea."
>
> "6c: Parents of high achieving children will express a preference for individual as opposed to collective credit for work done whereas the parents of low achieving children will not."
>
> "6d: Finally, the parents of high achieving children will have higher occupational and educational expectations for their *sons* than will the parents of low achieving children."

The rationale behind such a study is explained as follows (pp. 11-12) in the 1968-1969 proposal:

> "The results of Strodtbeck's study raise some interesting questions. For example, would it be possible to improve the level of intellectual attainment among disadvantaged children through a program designed to modify the value orientations of their parents? If so, how effective would such an approach be in comparison to the effectiveness of a typical Head Start program? And finally,how effective would both approaches be in combination? However, such questions presuppose a knowledge of 1) the existence of a relationship between the academic achievement of *disadvantaged* children and the value orientations of their parents; and 2) the nature of that relationship, if indeed there is one. So far as the present investigators are aware, no attempt has been made to replicate Strodtbeck's study in other parts of the country and, moreover, no attempt has been made to discover whether the relationship holds for disadvantaged children and their parents.* Hypothesis 6 and its corollaries are designed to fill this gap in our knowledge."

---

*Although the socioeconomic status of some of the boys who participated in Strodtbeck's study is described as "low", it is doubtful whether many of these were members of the class of persons characterized as "socially disadvantaged".

VI. Community Survey

Since the success of the Rural Child Care Project is to some extent dependent upon its image in target communities, one of the research objectives was to assess the community's knowledge of and attitudes toward the Project. Specifically, the investigators attempted to answer the following questions: "To what extent are individuals in the target communities aware of the existence of the Project? To what degree are they cognizant of the goals of the program? And, of those who are cognizant of the goals, to what extent do they think the Project is achieving them?"

METHOD

In order to assess awareness of the Project's existence and goals and also attitudes toward it among persons residing within the Project area, a survey was conducted in each of the ten Project counties during the latter half of April, 1968.

Subjects

In each county, persons were selected for participation in the survey on the basis of their apparent standing within the local power structure. In each county between 10 and 13 persons were selected to interview as representative of the leaders in their respective communities and an additional 10 to 13 persons were selected as representative of the local indigent adult population (See Table 66). The major criterion used for selection of respondents in the former sample consisted of the individual's occupational classification, whereas the soundness of the dwelling occupied by the respondent at the time of the survey constituted the major criterion used for selection of respondents in the latter sample. The Community Leader sample was comprised of businessmen, elected local officials, officers of local civic organizations, public school officials, professional persons, federal and state employees, and representatives of the mass media who were residing and/or working in the Project area at the time of the survey. The Local Indigent sample was composed of male and female heads of households, who at the time of the survey were residing in dwellings within the Project area which could be classified as "dilapidated" on the basis of the 1960 U.S. Census Housing criteria.* (See Enumerator's Reference Manuals, 1960 U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing.) The selection of respondents in both samples was made at random from among those present in the community during the period of interviewing.

---

*Without exception, interviews were conducted with no more than one person per household for the Local Indigent sample. Thus, when the female head of household was interviewed, the male household head was not interviewed and vice versa.

In all, 108 Community Leaders and 114 Local Indigents were interviewed for the survey. However, the data for three of the former and four of the latter had to be discarded for purposes of analysis because of procedural errors made by the interviewer at the time of the interview.* In addition, the data for a fifth respondent in the Local Indigent sample were discarded when it was discovered that his categorization as "Indigent" was questionable. Thus, the results of the survey are based on data obtained from the remaining 105 Community Leaders and 109 Local Indigents. Nearly all of the potential respondents contacted participated in the survey. (See Tables 66 and 67)

In terms of their composition, these two samples differed in at least three important respects in addition to the status differences separating them. First, the Community Leader sample was predominantly male (83.8%) while the Local Indigent sample was predominantly female (70.6%). Second, whereas the majority (64.8%) of the Community Leaders were judged by the interviewer to be in the 40-60 year age range, most of the Local Indigents were judged to be either younger (56.9%) or older (19.3%) than this. And third, although all but about 17% of the Community Leaders had received at least a high school education or the equivalent, a substantial proportion (63.3%) of the Local Indigents had not gone beyond the eighth grade in school.**

The two samples were similar in terms of their racial composition, the proportions of respondents having preschool children living at home, and the proportions of respondents having had prior affiliation with the Rural Child Care Project. Thus, the members of both samples were predominantly white; the majority of the members in each had no preschool children living in their homes at the time of the survey; and only a few respondents in each sample (n=15 for the Community Leaders, n=12 for the Local Indigents) had ever been affiliated in any manner whatsoever with the Project.

Materials

Appendix N presents the interview form which was used to obtain information from each respondent concerning his attitude toward the Project and his awareness of its existence and its objectives. As

---

*The procedural errors consisted of failure on the part of the interviewer to obtain crucial background information on the respondent (e.g., his prior affiliation with the Project) and/or to complete all sections of the Community Survey Questionnaire.

**Since the selection of respondents in both samples was accomplished on a random basis, it is assumed that these sample differences are due to underlying differences between the two populations from which the samples were drawn.

TABLE 66: COMMUNITY SURVEY RESPONDENTS INTERVIEWED

County	Indigent Adults	Community Leaders
Elliott	11	10
Floyd	13	12
Harlan	11	10
Knott	13	10
Lee	13	13
Letcher	10	10
Magoffin	11	11
Morgan	10	10
Owsley	11	12
Wolfe	11	10
Total	114	108

TABLE 67: COMMUNITY SURVEY RESPONDENTS USED IN ANALYSIS

County	Indigent Adults	Community Leaders
Elliott	11	9
Floyd	10	12
Harlan	11	10
Knott	13	10
Lee	13	13
Letcher	9	10
Magoffin	10	11
Morgan	10	9
Owsley	11	12
Wolfe	11	9
Total	109	105

may be seen by reference to this Appendix, each respondent was also asked to indicate his attitude toward the quality of present welfare programs; the extent to which the government should be involved in social welfare programs; the utilization of non-professionals to operate government supported day care centers; and the utilization of volunteers as aides in those centers. The remaining questions in the interview form were designed to obtain important background information on the respondent.*

This form, which was approved by the Head Start Office of Research and Evaluation, was constructed by the Research Staff. The form includes four masking items (Questions 1-4 on the actual form). Of these, the first three** were taken from an attitude scale used by Ford*** in his 1958 study of Southern Appalachian people whose sample included rural community leaders and indigents. The remaining 19 items were written by the Research Staff.

Procedure

The interviewers for the Community Survey consisted of three full-time permanent members of the Research Staff and two consultants who were hired specifically to interview the adult indigent group. The training for the Research Staff consisted of discussions and a review of interviewing techniques. Each of the consultants was trained by a Research Staff member. The procedure of this training was to go over the necessary forms in detail with particular emphasis on correct recording of responses. These consultants were given a copy of Instructions for Community Survey - Indigent Respondents (See Appendix O) which presented criteria for selecting indigent respondents and a detailed description of the interviewing procedures to be followed by each interviewer.

Selecting the actual respondents for the Community Leader sample proved to be a demanding task. In areas such as these Project counties, it is easy to confuse the more affluent members of the community with the community leaders because of their greater visibility. Accordingly, a "reputational" approach was taken in selecting respondents. The State Directory of Kentucky-which lists (among other categories) county officials, city officials, attorneys, school superintendents,* newspaper publishers and managers of radio stations in all Kentucky counties-was utilized to provide a partial list of prospective respondents. The Telephone Directories were also used to find names of physicians, ministers, businessmen and other influential people. (See Table 68)

---

*Educational background, length of residence in the Project county, prior affiliation with the Project, etc.

**These three items were apparently the cause of most of the uncooperativeness encountered by the interviewers, particularly with the Community Leaders. Some respondents abruptly terminated the interview upon hearing the first item.

***Ford, Thomas R. (Ed.) The Southern Appalachian Region - A Survey, Lexington; University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

It was impossible to schedule appointments for the interviews as the interview time varied greatly with each individual. Thus, the interviewer presented himself at the office of the potential respondent and requested that he participate in the survey. Nearly all Community Leader interviews were conducted in the county seats of the ten Project counties.

Each interviewer with the task of locating Local Indigents was given maps of the counties to which he was assigned. On these maps the area which each Child Development Center serves was clearly marked. The interviewer drove down the main roads in these areas looking for dwellings which could be classified as "dilapidated". He was instructed to divide his interviews between the two Child Development Center areas in each county.

Scoring of Community Survey Interviews

The general method for scoring the interviews obtained was straight forward with respect to those items on the Community Survey which were answered in a readily classifiable manner, such as "Yes", "Qualified Yes", "No", Don't Know" or "No Reply". For items 8 and 9 (see Appendix N) categories were devised in order to classify responses. To determine the reliabilities of these categories, three members of the research staff independently classified responses to these items. It was determined that for a number of respondents the raters were unable to agree unanimously even after reexamination of the response categories. In these cases, the disagreement was resolved by classifying the response according to the category agreed upon by two of the three raters.

RESULTS

The responses to each of the items on the Community Survey were summed by means of computer for the community leader sample and the

---

*Few school officials were interviewed for the reason that a short time before this survey, a Research Staff member had personally contacted county school superintendents and school principals to gain permission to do achievement testing in the schools and in doing so had given them a great deal of information about the Project.

TABLE 68: COMMUNITY LEADER SAMPLE CLASSIFIED BY OCCUPATION (n=105)

	n
Federal, State or Local Appointed Officials (other than public school)	28
Elected Officials (other than public school)	27
Businessmen and Farmers	25
Professionals (e.g., private college president, lawyer, minister, M.D., pharmacist, etc.)	14
Representatives of the Mass Media	6
Public School Officials	5
Total	105

indigent sample. The frequency and percentages of respondents in each response category for each item are presented in Appendix P. In addition to this descriptive summary, the results of two-sample Chi Square tests are presented where appropriate as an indication of whether the distribution of respondents among response categories departed significantly from chance.

No analysis of these data was performed comparing community leaders and indigent respondents within individual counties due to the small and unequal numbers of respondents within counties.

It was ascertained that a majority of the community leaders who participated in the survey: (a) were aware that the Rural Child Care Project is operating Child Development Centers within their respective counties (82.9%); (b) were cognizant of the locations of those centers (53.3%); (c) were correct on the number(s) of Centers in each location (53.4%); (d) claimed to be acquainted with a Rural Child Care Project employee (74.3%); (e) were able to correctly name a Rural Child Care Project employee (61.0%); (f) claimed to be familiar with the Rural Child Care Project program objectives (61.9%); (g) were able to state those objectives in essentially accurate form (52.4%); (h) indicated that they believe that the Rural Child Care Project is at least partially attaining its objectives (59.0%); (i) indicated that they believe that the Rural Child Care Project is doing at least a fairly good job (63.5%);(j) stated without reservation that they are in favor of using non-professionals to staff government supported day care centers (51.4%); (k) stated without reservation that they are in favor of using volunteers in government supported day care centers (72.4%); (l) stated without reservation that they are in favor of continuation of the Rural Child Care Project (63.8%); (m) stated without reservation that they think that the present relief and welfare program is a good thing (53.3%).

As a group, the members of the indigent sample were much less aware of the scope of the Project's activities and its objectives than were the members of the community leader sample. Thus, although a majority of the members of the indigent sample claimed to be aware of the Project's existence (67.9%), less than half of them: (a) were able to correctly name the location(s) of the Child Development Centers within their respective counties (18.3%); (b) were correct on the number of Centers in each location (7.3%); (c) claimed to be acquainted with a Rural Child Care Project employee (34.9%); (d) were able to correctly name a Project employee (28.4%); (e) claimed to be familiar with the Rural Child Care Project program objectives (26.6%); and (f) were able to state the program objectives in essentially accurate form (20.2%).

As was the case with the community leaders, a majority of the indigent sample: (a) stated without reservation that they were in favor of using non-professionals to staff government supported day care centers (56.9%); (b) stated without reservation that they were in favor of using volunteers in government supported day care centers (90.8%);

(c) stated that they think that the present relief and welfare program is a good thing (81.7%).

Whereas 54.1% of the indigents stated that they would be in favor of continuation of the Rural Child Care Project, only 38.6% stated that they believe that the Rural Child Care Project is attaining its objectives and only 39.4% indicated that they believe that the Rural Child Care Project is doing at least a fairly good job.

In general it appears that the sample of community leaders is better informed concerning the Rural Child Care Project than the sample of indigents interviewed on the Community Survey. Both leaders and indigents in the Project counties expressed favorable attitudes toward welfare programs in general, however the community leaders appear more favorable toward the Rural Child Care Project than the indigent respondents in terms of their opinions concerning whether the Project is doing a good job and attaining its objectives.

It may be that the ability to articulate the Project's objectives is highly related to the expression of a favorable attitude toward the Project and a positive assessment of its effectiveness. The Community Survey results indicate that leaders in the Project counties were able to articulate the Project's objectives to a greater degree than the indigent respondents.

Anecdotal evidence obtained after the survey was completed indicated that respondents (mainly from the leader sample) had contacted the county Project office to inform the staff that "someone was in town checking up on them" and that the respondent had been sure to give a "good" report. This feedback indicates on the one hand that respondents may have withheld honest opinions which they considered as potentially harmful to the local Project staff, but on the other hand, it suggests the degree to which the Project staff has been able to enlist strong local support and acceptance among community leaders.

There is some evidence to suggest that greater effort is needed in publicizing the objectives and other particulars of the Project among the local indigent population from which most Project participants are recruited. Of course, the fact that indigent respondents in this study were less able to identify accurately Project center locations and to articulate Project objectives is to be expected. It is assumed that such persons will be more isolated from the community and hence, possess less first-hand information about projects within the community. It is interesting to note that although Project families (and staff, to a large extent) are recruited solely from the indigent population, they are much less well known to the indigent citizens than to community leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

No further investigation of community attitudes towards the Rural Child Care Project has been proposed for 1968-1969. It has been proposed, however, to interview public school teachers of the first and second grades in schools which have received large numbers of children who participated in the Rural Child Care Project Child Development Center program prior to entering first grade. The specific hypothesis to be investigated is stated in the proposal as follows (p. 9):

> "Hypothesis 8: Elementary school teachers in Project county schools who have had a moderate degree of exposure to former Project children will be generally favorable in their attitudes toward the Project and will rate former Project children significantly higher in achievement and in eagerness to learn than a comparable group of non-Project elementary school children. In addition, in those schools having relatively high proportions of former Project children enrolled in grades one and two, the teachers will attribute improvements in the school curricula and the advent of accelerated programs--if such exist--to the impact of the Rural Child Care Project."

The purpose of this hypothesis is explained in the proposal (p. 12) as follows:

> "Hypothesis 8 is designed to provide factual information on the nature of the impact of the Child Development Program on the schools in the Project area that have substantial proportions of former Project participants enrolled in grades one throught three. Among other things, an attempt will be made to assess the attitudes of teachers in these schools toward former Project children and toward the Child Development Program itself."

3

VII. Evaluation of the Resident Non-Professional Staff

The Rural Child Care Project is designed to combat the effects of poverty and cultural deprivation in Eastern Kentucky through a comprehensive program of day care for preschool children and social casework and homemaker services for their families. One of the major assumptions of the Rural Child Care Project is that indigenous personnel can be successfully trained to provide the above services.

A major difficulty in attempting to evaluate whether effective day care and social services can be provided by a resident non-professional staff is the fact that staff effectiveness is confounded with the effectiveness of other aspects of the overall program. For example, if children who attend Project Day Care Centers show greater achievement in school than similarly deprived children who do not participate in the Project, it can be argued that the non-professional staff is exerting a positive effect. However, if the Project children do not evidence greater achievement than their comparison group this does not necessarily mean that the non-professional staff is ineffective in providing Project services.

In earlier sections of the present report data have been presented on intellectual functioning and achievement of former Project children and changes in attitudes and household conditions of Project parents. All of these investigations represent indirect evidence of the effectiveness of the non-professional staff.

Two more direct approaches to evaluating the effectiveness of the resident non-professional staff were proposed during the past contract year: 1) Measurement of the extent to which their on-the-job performance meets the expectations of supervisors; and 2) Objective testing on content presented at formal training sessions. The latter approach was not followed since consultation with members of the Project Director's professional staff indicated it was not advisable or practicable to administer objective tests to the non-professional staff on material covered in training sessions. Thus, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the resident non-professional staff in the present report rests solely upon supervisory ratings of on-the-job performance.

Before describing the procedures and results of this limited evaluation, it would be well to review the characteristics of and data available on non-professional personnel. During 1967-1968, the resident non-professional staff was composed of the following job categories: Social Worker, Case Aide, Homemaker, Senior Teacher*, Teacher, Teacher Aide, Clerical Aide, Transportation Aide and Cook. The job specifications for these positions are presented in Appendix Q.

---

*Subjects holding this position were promoted from Teacher to Senior Teacher during the period in which this study was conducted.

Persons hired in these positions within each of the Project counties are designated as "resident non-professionals" because they reside in the same locale as Project families and for the most part, at the time of hiring, would not have qualified in terms of educational background and relevant experience for similar positions within the state Department of Child Welfare. The positions of Cook and Transportation Aide are "non-professional" in a more academic sense.

A study done in 1966 by the Research Staff reported that as a group, the resident non-professional staff was predominately Caucasian (99%), female (93%), married (83%), between 25-49 years old (69%) (range: 18-64, $\overline{X}$=36), and previously employed prior to being hired by the Rural Child Care Project in white collar jobs (44%) or skilled positions (31%). Their median annual family income prior to employment with the Project was $3,340 (43% were judged below the poverty line of $3,000 annual family income). The median number of years of education completed by the group as a whole was 11.*

Statistics compiled by the Project central office during 1967, shown in Table 69 below, reveal the average number of years of education completed for each of the non-professional staff positions:

TABLE 69

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS OF EDUCATION
COMPLETED BY RESIDENT NON-PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Position	Average Number Years of Education Completed
Social Worker	14.4
Case Aide	12.4
Clerical Aide	12.2
Teacher†	11.9
Teacher Aide	10.3
Homemaker	9.9
Transportation Aide	9.3
Cook	8.5

†This category includes those Teachers promoted to Senior Teacher

---

*Whitcomb, G. Robert, Research Report: Descriptive Statistics on Residential Non-Professional Staff as of April 1, 1966. Rural Child Growth and Development Project, OEO Grants 437-1-D and 437-1-TR, Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation, August 10, 1966. (Xerox)

Table 69 indicates that the positions of Social Worker, Case Aide, Clerical Aide and Teacher are filled by persons with more formal training than the other four job categories. In the study conducted by the Research Staff in 1966 it was argued that the positions of Social Worker and Head Teacher (the positions of Senior Teacher, Teacher and Case Aide did not exist at that time) represent an upper level non-professional staff which is dissimilar in education and socioeconomic status to members of the lower level non-professional staff (i.e., Clerical Aide, Teacher Aide, Homemaker, Cook, and Transporation Aide) and to families served by the Project.

If the non-professional staff positions are ranked in order of current 1968 salaries, this distinction between upper and lower level non-professional staff is supported, i.e., Social Workers, Case Aides, Senior Teachers and Teachers earn higher salaries than Teacher Aides, Clerical Aides, Homemakers, Cooks and Transporation Aides, as Table 70 indicates.

TABLE 70

SALARIES OF NON-PROFESSIONAL STAFF (CURRENT 1968)

Position	Annual Salary
Social Worker	$4,960
Case Aide	$4,296
Senior Teacher	$4,080
Teacher	$3,696
Clerical Aide	$3,348
Homemaker	$3,348
Teacher Aide	$3,192
Cook	$3,192
Transportation Aide	$2,700

Despite the discrepancy that occurs in terms of the ranking of the position of Clerical Aide according to whether the criterion is education or salary level, either ranking indicates that Homemakers, Teacher Aides, Cooks and Transportation Aides can be considered as lower level non-professional staff positions.

The 1966 study reported that of the lower level staff (including the position of Clerical Aide), 60% had never worked or had been unemployed for some time prior to employment by the Project. The mean and median number of years of education was 10, a full year less than for the entire non-professional staff when Social Workers and Teachers were included. There were no college graduates among the lower level non-professional staff. Their median family income of $3,000 a year prior to employment with the Project was below the median for the entire non-professional staff. Half of the lower level staff was below the poverty line of $3,000 a year prior to joining the Project. Although the lower level staff as a group appear less advantaged than the upper level non-professional personnel, it should be noted that they are still significantly more advantaged than families served by the Project. The median annual income in 1966 for Project families was reported as $1,600 with 90% of them below the poverty line of $3,000 annual family income. A comparison between lower level staff and Project parents indicated that the staff personnel had attained significantly more education. Comparisons of the non-professional lower level staff (94% female) with female parents served by the Project revealed that the latter group was more likely to have a history of unemployment. Thus, the lower level non-professional staff has a higher income, more education, higher occupational status and is less likely to have an unemployment history, than Project families, despite the fact that they are less educated and economically advantaged than the upper level staff.

Because of the distinction made in previous research between an "upper" and "lower level" non-professional staff, it is of interest to note if current findings support such a distinction.

METHOD

Subjects

A total of 138 members of the resident non-professional staff were rated twice during the period of October, 1967 through June, 1968, by their supervisors in terms of their on-the-job performance.

Thirty-one subjects were eliminated from the study because their initial (October, 1967) and final (June, 1968) ratings were not completed by the same supervisor.* Thus, the sample upon which the evaluation of the non-professional staff was based numbered 107.

Subjects were classified according to job category as follows: Social Worker (N=7), Case Aide (N=6), Homemaker (N=21), Senior Teacher (N=16), Teacher (N=11), Teacher Aide (N=25), Clerical Aide (N=5), Cook (N=9), and Transportation Aide (N=7).

---

*This occurred in cases where supervisors left the program and a replacement was hired in the interim between initial and final rating. The only exception to this is the inclusion of initial and final ratings on 33 persons done by two different supervisors who were found to be in complete agreement and therefore counted as the "same" rater.

Raters

Six Regional Training Supervisors (see "Social Worker II" job description in Appendix Q) and one Area Training Supervisor (see "Social Worker III" job description in Appendix Q) completed ratings for 138 members of the non-professional staff. Only five of the raters, however, completed both the initial and final ratings (October, 1967 and June, 1968) on employees under their supervision. As indicated above, initial and final ratings done by different raters were not used as data in the present study. Each of these five supervisors whose ratings were used rated from 17 to 35 non-professional staff members and from 7 to 9 different non-professional staff positions. Vacancies within the non-professional staff in certain counties made it impossible for some supervisors to rate employees in all job categories. Three of the raters were women, two were men.

Employee Evaluation Form

Evaluation of the effectiveness of the non-professional Project staff was accomplished through the use of the Employee Evaluation Form which was adapted (from a form used by the Kentucky Department of Mental Health) by the Project Director's staff during the first quarter of the past fiscal year. A copy of the Employee Evaluation Form is presented in Appendix R. Ratings obtained from this form were used in the present study to measure the extent to which on-the-job performance of the non-professional staff met the expectations of their supervisors.

Each of the first 13 items on the Employee Evaluation Form includes five descriptive alternatives ranging from maximum to minimum acceptability in terms of a specific job-related trait, ability, or personality characteristic "important for success" (see Appendix R). In addition, item 14 assesses the employee in terms of overall acceptability when compared to other employees with the same length of service in the same job situation.*

For purposes of scoring, the descriptive alternatives for each item were converted to a five-point scale. Thus, for any item, a score of "5" indicates the employee was rated as maximally acceptable, whereas a score of "1" indicates minimum acceptability for that item (see Appendix R for the specific score assigned to each descriptive alternative for each of the 14 items).

---

*Space is provided at the end of the Employee Evaluation Form for summary remarks and recommendations which were not incorporated into the data analyses.

Procedure

Rating of individual employees by their supervisors was done in a manner determined by the Project Director's office. The Employee Evaluation Form had been adopted by the Project Director's staff for use in counseling with non-professional employees. The supervisor first completed the rating alone and then called in the employee to discuss the ratings, item by item. In cases where supervisor and employee both agreed that a given rating was in error (i.e., too high, too low, or otherwise inaccurate) that rating was altered. In the present study no data are available concerning which ratings may have been altered in this fashion. It was orginally intended by the Project Director to use the Employee Evaluation Form at regular intervals. Due to turn-over in regional staff, however, the use of this form was discontinued. According to the agreement with the Research Division, the Project Director did provide initial ratings (completed by October 31, 1967) and final ratings (completed by June 31, 1968) on non-professional staff members enabling thereby a measure of change in on-the-job performance for each of the non-professional staff positions.

RESULTS

The plan of analysis in the present study was as follows: for each job category, initial and final ratings for each employee were subjected to an item by item comparison by means of the Sign Test (Siegel, 1956). The Sign Test indicates whether change (to a more or less favorable rating) from initial to final rating on a given item for employees within a given job category is significant. Means and medians were computed for each item within each job category (for any given item, scores range from 1 - 5 inclusive). Analyses reported in this study are based upon initial and final ratings performed by the same supervisor. The results of the 126 Sign Tests performed (for each of fourteen items with each of nine job categories) are summarized in the following sections. The level of significance chosen for the analysis is $\rho<.10$, since any "significant" findings can only be taken as tentative at this stage, considering the uncontrolled manner in which the data were gathered and the small samples involved with most job categories.

Job Class: Social Worker I

Number Rated: 7

Findings: None of the item by item comparisons of initial and final ratings reached significance. Means for all fourteen items range between 3.00 and 4.14 (initial ratings) and 3.14 to 4.43 (final ratings). Medians range between 3.00 and 4.00 (initial) and 3.00 and 5.00 (final).

Job Class: Case Aide

Number Rated: 6

Findings: None of the sign tests comparing change from initial to final ratings for each of the fourteen items reached significance. Item means ranged from 3.00 to 4.17 (initial rating) and 2.67 to 4.33 (final ratings). Medians ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 (initial) and 3.00 to 4.50 (final).

Job Class: Homemaker

Number Rated: 21

Findings: None of the sign tests comparing changes from initial to final ratings attained the chosen level of significance. For two items, however, the level of significance was approximated: On item number 1, Homemakers were rated as less accurate in correctness of work duties performed on the final rating ($\rho<.145$), and on item number 10, Homemakers were rated as having greater job knowledge of work duties on the final rating ($\rho<.125$). Means ranged from 3.10 to 4.00 (initial rating) and 2.95 to 4.10 (final ratings). Medians ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 for both initial and final ratings.

Job Class: Senior Teacher

Number Rated: 16

Findings: Senior Teachers were rated as showing increased creativity (item 3) on the final rating compared to the initial rating ($\rho<.062$), and on item 8, as being more faithful in attendance than on the initial rating ($\rho<.09$). On item 13 (Courtesy) the difference between initial and final ratings approached the level of significance ($\rho<.145$), i.e., Senior Teachers were rated the second time as being more courteous.

Job Class: Teacher

Number Rated: 11

Findings: On item 11 (Quantity of Work), the difference between initial and final ratings approached significance ($\rho<.109$). Item means ranged from 2.91 to 3.91 (initial ratings) and 2.73 to 3.73 (final ratings). Medians ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 (initial) and 2.00 to 4.00 (final).

Job Class: Teacher Aide

Number Rated: 25

Findings: Teacher Aides were rated as less alert (item 2) on the second rating ($\rho <.105$), and as having shown a decrease in overall evaluation (item 14) on the second rating ($\rho <.055$). The decrease between initial and final ratings on item 12 (Stability) approaches significance ($\rho <.145$). Item means range from 2.75 to 3.80 (initial ratings) and 2.68 to 3.84 (final ratings). Item medians range from 3.00 to 4.00 for both initial and final ratings.

Job Class: Clerical Aide

Number Rated: 5

Findings: On item 3 (Creativity) there was a significant increase between initial and final ratings ($\rho <.062$). For item 13, (Courtesy) there was a decrease from initial to final ratings that approached significance ($\rho <.125$). Item means ranged from 2.60 to 4.20 (initial rating) and 3.00 to 4.60 (final rating). Item medians ranged from 3.00 to 5.00 for both initial and final ratings.

Job Class: Cook

Number Rated: 9

Findings: On item 7 (Physical Fitness), Cooks were rated lower on the second rating, a finding which approaches significance ($\rho <.125$). Item means range from 2.56 to 4.11 (initial rating) and 2.78 to 3.89 (final rating). Item medians range from 2.00 to 4.00 (initial) and 3.00 to 4.00 (final).

Job Class: Transportation Aide

Number Rated: 7

Findings: None of the sign tests yielded significant differences between initial and final ratings on any of the items. Item means ranged from 2.71 to 4.00 (initial ratings) and 2.28 to 4.14 (final ratings). Item medians ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 (initial) and 3.00 to 5.00 (final).

Conclusions

Any conclusions drawn from the data presented in this report must be considered as tentative due to the lack of control exercised over the manner in which the employee ratings were conducted. It is not known, for example, to what extent a "halo effect" was induced or increased by the practice of reviewing the ratings with the employee.

In addition, the decision not to conduct objective tests of material presented in training sessions severely limited the data with which to evaluate the effectiveness of the non-professional staff in providing Project services.

Looking at the ratings of the non-professional staff with the above limitations in mind, it can be noted that in general there are few indications of significant change from initial to final ratings. No significant improvement or decrement whatsoever was found for the positions of Social Worker, Case Aide, and Transportation Aide. Only Teachers promoted to Senior Teachers during the interim between the October and June ratings showed significant improvement on some items, whereas Homemakers, Teachers, Teacher Aides, and Clerical Aides showed some "mixed" change, i.e., significant improvement on some items and significant decrement on other items. Cooks were the only staff personnel that showed significant decrement alone (on one item).

These findings lend little support to the distinction made in the 1966 study between an "upper level" and "lower level" non-professional staff. That is, significant changes in ratings occurred for Teachers promoted to Senior Teachers, but not for Social Workers or Case Aides. Significant changes over time did occur for personnel in lower level staff positions, but the nature of the items and the direction of change does not suggest a clear trend that would distinguish lower level from upper level non-professional personnel. The Employee Evaluation Form does not appear to be sensitive to differences in job related skills or background factors which distinguish the upper and lower level staff positions. Thus, any significant changes from initial to final ratings cannot be explained as related to "upper" or "lower" staff position.

Other tentative interpretations of these findings are presented as a basis for further, more systematic, evaluation of the non-professional staff: 1. The Employee Evaluation Form may be most sensitive in rating staff in positions for which minimal formal education and background experience are required and extensive on-the-job training is necessary. According to ranking by education and salary level, the job categories showing significant changes from initial to final ratings are those occupying an intermediate rank. Job categories showing no change from initial to final ratings represent the highest non-professional staff positions which require the most formal education and extensive on-the-job training (Social Workers and Clerical Aides) and the lowest salaried, part-time position which requires a license to perform a technical skill and little on-the-job training (Transportation Aide).

2. The Employee Evaluation Form may show more positive changes in ratings over time for employees who are promoted. In the present study, Teachers promoted to Senior Teachers during the interim between initial and final ratings showed positive changes in their creativity,

attendance, and courtesy; whereas Teachers who were not promoted during the same period were rated as significantly less productive in the quantity of work on the final rating. Teacher Aides decreased on the final rating in terms of alertness, stability, and in overall evaluation. Whether these findings are the result of a bias on the part of supervisors toward personnel who were promoted ("halo effect") or whether they reflect actual differences in employee competence (which led to promotion) remains to be determined. The findings for Clerical Aides, that is, a significant increase in creativity combined with the significant decrease in courtesy, may be related to the fact that Clerical Aides in general have achieved higher education status than other members of the non-professional staff who are paid equal or higher salaries (specifically, Homemakers and Teachers). Thus, for Clerical Aides, there may be some degree of conflict inherent in their job status, which minimizes competence and formal background in comparison to other positions on the non-professional staff.

3. The Employee Evaluation Form may be inappropriate for rating specific skills related to providing certain Project services. The items on the Employee Evaluation Form appear most relevant to how well the employee gets along with supervisors and fellow employees and complies with administrative procedures. It may be useful in assessing how well an employee is working within the Project structure but it does not clearly evaluate the quality of specific Project services he has been trained to render. For example: Homemakers were rated as decreasing in job accuracy and at the same time as increasing in job knowledge (these findings approached statistical significance). This paradoxical finding may reflect the fact that a Homemaker could have been less proficient in filling out report forms but at the same time could have shown increasing skill in meeting certain needs of Project families. In a similar manner it was reported that Cooks decreased significantly from initial to final rating in terms of physical fitness. The Employee Evaluation Form does not indicate in what way significant change in this item is related to effectiveness in providing Project services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the foregoing discussion, further attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of the resident non-professional staff should be specific with respect to skills required for that job category. Any rating scale employed would be best designed through the joint cooperation of the Research and Project offices. To determine employee effectiveness, the type of service, goals and procedures must be operationally defined. In some job categories, employee effectiveness might be assessed in part through direct observation of the employee's behavior in the job setting or in structured situations. For example, if Teachers have been trained in procedures of language stimulation designed to achieve the goal of increasing verbal skills of Project children, observations of their skill in providing verbal stimulation would be an appropriate source of data for evaluation.

While it is desirable to conduct a rating of general skills, such as those covered in the Employee Evaluation Form, in order to determine how well the non-professional staff is able to function within the Project structure, further explication of these items would be needed. For instance, in the case of a rating on creativity, evidence that supervisors are using the same criterion to evaluate creativity should be gathered. Further, supervisors should be trained prior to rating in the use of standardized rating criteria and rating procedures. The distinction between procedures to be followed in using instruments for research or counseling purposes should be emphasized and maintained. In the present study the choice of rating instrument, the rating procedures employed, and the use of the scale as a counseling device were not determined by the Research Division, thus making it impossible to insure proper methodological controls in data collection.

One of the most important aspects of future employee evaluations should be in the area of training. Some method which is acceptable to the non-professional staff might be implemented to determine whether the content and procedures used in training are measurably affecting their skills in providing Project services. If the distinctions between upper and lower level staff are considered to have important implications, beyond those of salary and educational background, they should be specified in terms of training objectives and of job skills.

In summary, despite methodological shortcomings, the present study raises some interesting questions for further investigation of specific job related skills. It is recommended that further study incorporate observational methods to assess employee behavior and increased standardization of rating criteria and procedures used by supervisors.

SUMMARY

Children who previously attended a Rural Child Care Project Child Development Center for a minimum of sixty days show a loss in Stanford-Binet I.Q. by the time they have had two years of formal schooling. This loss is greatest during the first year of public school for those children whose initial I.Q. scores (obtained while enrolled in a Child Development Center) were above 80 and who were subsequently retained at the end of the first grade. Former Project participants enrolled in the first and second grades during 1967-1968 did not perform better than a matched comparison group on the California Achievement Test. In addition, both groups of children performed from one to six months below the C.A.T. norms. Analyses of the achievement test performance of former Project participants in terms of their exposure to ESEA Title I programs at the first and second grade levels indicated that children in counties rated as having the best Title I programs obtained significantly lower C.A.T. scores than children in the county which had no Title I program. This finding may be due in part to suspected socioeconomic differences between the counties involved in this latter comparison.

The prediction that changes in patterns of household operations would improve significantly for those Project families receiving social casework and homemaking services was partially confirmed. Due to serious methodological and conceptual problems encountered in this phase of the evaluation, the findings are not considered conclusive. Attempts to assess the attitudes of Project parents toward the rights and liberties of children and the use of fear in disciplining children also met with limited success since the scales devised to measure these child rearing attitudes were apparently invalid. Findings indicate that Project parents did not become less punitive, more supportive, or more consistent in their attitudes towards children as a function of exposure to the Child Development Center program.

The prediction that Project parents would become more favorable in their attitudes toward the value of a high school education as a result of exposure to the Child Development program was partially confirmed. That is, Project parents indicated initial highly positive attitudes and showed a significant positive increase after a four and one-half month interim, but this increase was not related to the amount of Child Development Center attendance of their children.

A survey conducted with a sample of community leaders and indigent persons residing in counties serviced by the Rural Child Care Project indicated that in general, local leaders, when compared to indigent citizens, were better informed concerning the Project, more accurate in articulating its objectives and more favorable in terms of their evaluation of its effectiveness.

Finally, the effectiveness of the resident non-professional staff in administering Project services (including Child Development, Homemaking, and Social Work services) was partially assessed by means of

ratings of on the job performance done by supervisors. Findings indicate that significant improvement in job performance was shown by Teachers who were subsequently promoted; whereas other staff personnel showed no change or evidenced improvement in some areas and decrement in others.

Most of the recommendations made throughout this final report have been incorporated in the 1968-1969 continuing research evaluation of the Rural Child Care Project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alpern, G. D. "The Failure of a Nursery School Enrichment Program for Culturally Disadvantaged Children," cited in L. T. DiLorenzo "Effects of Year-Long Pre-Kindergarten Programs on Intelligence and Language of Educationally Disadvantaged Children," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 36 (1968), 36-37.

Bereiter, Carl and Engelmann, Siegfried. *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1966.

Blatt, B. and Garfunkel, F. "Educating Intelligence: Degerminants of School Behavior of Disadvantaged Children," *Exceptional Children*, 33 (May, 1967), 601-608.

Bloom, B. S.; Davis, A.; Hess, R. *Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation*. N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1965, p. 25.

Brazziel, W. F. "Two Years of Head Start," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48, (March, 1967), 344-348.

Cawley, John R. "An Assessment of Intelligence, Psycholinguistic Abilities and Learning Aptitudes Among Preschool Children," (Abstract), In *Research In Education*, 3 (April, 1968), 79.

Chandler, Marvin, *et al*. "Project Head Start and the Culturally Deprived in Rochester, New York, A Study of Participating and Non-Participating Families in Areas Served by Project Head Start in Rochester, Final Report," (Abstract), In *Research In Education*, 3 (March, 1968), 72.

Chorost, Sherwood B., *et al*. "An Evaluation of the Effects of a Summer Head Start Program," (Abstract), In *Research In Education*, 3 (April, 1968), 80.

Clarizio, Harvey F. "Maternal Attitude Change Associated with Project Head Start," *Journal of Negro Education*, 37 (1968), 106-113.

Coleman, J. S., Campbill, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfield, F. D., and York, R. L. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Crow, L. D., Murray, W. I., and Smythe, H. H. *Educating the Culturally Deprived Child*. New York: David McKay, 1966.

DiLorenzo, L. T. "Effects of Year-Long Pre-Kindergarten Programs on Intelligence and Language of Educational Disadvantaged Children," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 36 (1968), 36-41.

Deutsch, Martin. *Annual Report 1965*, (N. Y. Institute for Developmental Studies, N. Y. Medical College, 1965).

Deutsch, Martin. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process" in Poverty in America. L. A. Ferman, J. L. Kornbluh, A. Huber (Eds.), Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965, 353-370.

Dyer, P. B. "Effects of Environmental Variables on the Achievement of Elementary School Children in Trinidad," (Abstract), In Research Relating to Children, Bulletin #21. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, (1965), 106.

Eisenberg, L. "Progress Report #3, Contract 510, Prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C., (undated report)" in D. K. Osborn, "Some Gains from the Head Start Experience," Childhood Education, 44 (September, 1967), 8-11.

Estes, P. F. "Guidance Counseling for Preschoolers Strengthens Speaking and Social Skills" in "Ten Research Lessons That Are Shaking Educational Programs," Nation's Schools, 81 (February, 1968), 62-63.

Ford, Thomas R. (Ed.). The Southern Appalachian Region - A Survey. Lexington; University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Gray, S. W. and Klaus, R. A. "The Early Training Project for Disadvantaged Children: A Report After 5 Years," Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 33 (1968) 41, 52.

Hickerson, Nathaniel. Education for Alienation. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1966, p. 45.

Hodes, Marion R. "An Assessment and Comparison of Selected Characteristics Among Culturally Disadvantaged Head Start Children, Culturally Disadvantaged Non-Head Start Children and Non-Culturally Disadvantaged Children," (Abstract), In Research In Education, 3 (April, 1968), 81.

Holmes, D. and Holmes, M. B. "An Evaluation of Differences Among Different Classes of Head Start Participants. Final Report." (Abstract), In Research In Education, 3 (May, 1968), 87.

Hyman, I. and Sill, Deborah. "A Research Report on the 1965 Summer Head Start in Lawrence Township Public Schools, Lawrence Township, New Jersey Public Schools, 1965 (Monograph)," Cited in W. F. Brazziel, "Two Years of Head Start," Phi Delta Kappan, 48 (March, 1967), 344-348.

Johnson, H. S. and Palomares, U. H. "A Study of Some Ecological, Economic and Social Factors Influencing Parental Participation In Project Head Start," (Abstract), In Research In Education, 3 (April, 1968), 81.

Kagan, Jerome. "Sex Typing and Sex Role Identity" in M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Huffman (Eds.) Review of Child Development Research Vol. I: (NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964), 137-168.

Kraft, I. "Head Start to What?" Nation, (September 5, 1966), 179-182.

Krider, Mary and Petsche, Mary. "An Evaluation of Head Start Enrollment Programs as They Affect the Intellectual Ability, the Social Adjustment and the Achievement Level of Five-Year-Old Children," (Abstract), In Research In Education, 3 (May, 1968), 87.

Metfessel, N. S. Unpublished research cited in J. L. Frost and G. R. Hawkes The Disadvantaged Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1966.

Miller, Harry L. Education for the Disadvantaged. N. Y.: The Free Press, 1967, 141-142.

Office of Economic Opportunity Head Start Office. "Congressional Report. Prepared for Members of the U. S. Congress. Washington, D. C., 1966 (Unpublished Report)." Cited in D. K. Osborn, "Some Gains from the Head Start Experience," Childhood Education, 44 (September, 1967), 8-11.

Office of Economic Opportunity Public Affairs Office. "Evaluation of Summer Head Start Programs. Washington, D. C., 1966 (Unpublished Report)." Cited in D. K. Osborn, "Some Gains from the Head Start Experience," Childhood Education, 44 (September, 1967), 8-11.

Osborn, D. K. "Some Gains from the Head Start Experience," Childhood Education, 44 (September, 1967), 8-11.

Pierce-Jones, J., et al. "Outcomes of Individual and Programatic Variations Among Project Head Start Centers, Summer, 1965, Final Report." (Abstract), In Research In Education, 3 (April, 1968), 80.

Rice, Robert R. "The Housing Environment as a Factor in Child Development Research, Final Report," (Abstract), In Research In Education, 3 (April, 1968), 79.

Rieber, M. and Womack, M. "The Intelligence of Preschool Children as Related to Ethnic and Demographic Variables" Exceptional Children, 34 (April, 1968), 609-614.

Rosenthal, R. "How Well Students Do Depends on How Well Teachers Expect Them To Do" in "10 Research Lessons That are Shaking Educational Programs" Nation's Schools, 81 (February, 1968), 57-58.

Rosica, R. "Smaller Classes, Consultant Teachers Boost Reading, Arithmetic Scores" in "10 Research Lessons That are Shaking Educational Programs" Nation's Schools, 81 (February, 1968), 59-60.

Rundquist, E. A. and Sletto, R. F. Personality And The Depression. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1936.

Schwertfeger, Jane and Weikart, D. P. "The Nature of Preschool Benefits," Michigan Journal of Education, 44 (March, 1967), 18-20, 34.

Siedel, Jr., H. E., Barkley, Mary Jo and Stith, Doris. "Evaluation of a Program for Project Head Start," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 110, (1967), 185-197.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Smith, M. P. "Intellectual Differences in Five-Year-Old Underprivileged Girls and Boys With and Without PreKindergarten School Experience" Journal of Educational Research, 61 (April, 1968), 348-350.

Steglich, W. G. and Cartwright, W. J. "Report of the Effectiveness of Project Head Start." Unpublished report on Contract No. OEO-2465. Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas, 1967, (mimeographed).

Thurstone, L. L. Scales for the Measurement of Social Attitudes, University of Chicago Press, 1936b.

Thurstone, L. L. "Measurement of Social Attitudes," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 26 (1931a), 249-269.

Thurstone, L. L. "Theory of Attitude Measurement," Psychological Bulletin, 36 (1929), 222-241.

Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a summary prepared by the Office of Legislation, U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C., for the guidance of schools and colleges, 1965.

Tiegs, E. W. and Clark, W. W. California Achievement Tests, Lower Primary Manual, Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, 1963.

Weikart, D. P., et al. Perry Preschool Progress Report (Michigan: Ypsilanti Public Schools, 1964).

Whitcomb, G. Robert. Research Report: Descriptive Statistics on Residential Non-Professional Staff as of April 1, 1966. Rural Child Growth and Development Project, OEO Grants 437-1-D and 437-1-TR, Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation, Inc., August 10, 1966. (Xerox)

Wilkerson, Doxey. "Programs and Practices in Compensatory Education" Review of Educational Research XXXV (1965), 425-439.

Wolff, M. and Stein, Annie. "Head Start Six Months Later,: Phi Delta Kappan, 48 (March, 1967), 349-350.

Zigler, Edward and Butterfield, Earl C. "Motivational Aspects of Changes in I.Q. Test Performance of Culturally Deprived Nursery School Children," Child Development, 39 (March, 1968), 1-14.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.
Title I Questionnaire

SERVICES AND EQUIPMENT PROVIDED BY TITLE I PROGRAM IN GRADES ONE AND TWO DURING THE 1967-1968 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL DISTRICT

I. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

NOTE: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT REFERS TO TITLE I FUNDS USED TO IMPROVE THE COURSE OF STUDY OFFERED IN GRADES ONE AND TWO OF A SCHOOL SYSTEM. FOR EXAMPLE, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT REFERS TO MONEY USED TO PROVIDE TEACHER OR TEACHER AIDE SERVICES, TEXTBOOKS AND WORKBOOKS, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPLIES NEEDED IN THE PRESENTATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL (INCLUDING ART AND MUSIC) TO PUPILS. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT DOES NOT REFER TO MONEY USED FOR BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OR FOR OTHER SERVICES SUCH AS FOOD, CLOTHING, MEDICAL OR SOCIAL SERVICES.

1. Were Title I funds provided in this county for Curriculum Development in Grades 1 and 2 during the 1967-1968 school year?

   ☐ Yes

   ☐ No

2. Were Title I funds provided in Grades 1 and 2 of this county for each subject area listed below during the 1967-1968 school year? [RECORD THE RESPONSE BY PUTTING AN "X" IN THE PROPER BOX OF EITHER COLUMN "a" OR COLUMN "b" FOR EACH SUBJECT AREA. FOR EACH "YES" RESPONSE, ENTER THE DOLLAR AMOUNT SPENT FOR THAT SUBJECT AREA IN THE SPACE PROVIDED IN COLUMN "c".]

	Col. a	Col. b	Col. c
	NO	YES	IF YES, DOLLAR AMOUNT
A. Art	☐	☐	$
B. Crafts	☐	☐	
C. Health	☐	☐	
D. Mathematics	☐	☐	
E. Music	☐	☐	
F. Physical Education	☐	☐	
G. Reading	☐	☐	
H. Special Education	☐	☐	

I. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (Cont'd.)

	Col. a	Col. b	Col. c
	NO	YES	IF YES, DOLLAR AMOUNT
I. Speech	☐	☐	$__________
J. Other*__________ Please Specify	☐	☐	__________
K. Other*__________ Please Specify	☐	☐	__________
L. Other*__________ Please Specify	☐	☐	__________
M. TOTAL Curriculum Development Funds			__________

3. For each subject area listed below, enter in COLUMN "a" the number of FULL-TIME CERTIFIED TEACHERS provided in Grades 1 and 2 of this county during the 1967-1968 school year by Title I funds. In COLUMN "b", enter the number of PART-TIME CERTIFIED TEACHERS provided in Grades 1 and 2 of this county during the 1967-1968 school year by Title I funds. If no such services were provided in a particular subject area, enter a "0" in the appropriate box.

NOTE: A CERTIFIED TEACHER IS ANY PERSON WHO POSSESSES A TEACHING CERTIFICATE--EITHER REGULAR OR EMERGENCY--FROM THE KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

	Column a Number of Full-Time Certified Teachers	Column b Number of Part-Time Certified Teachers
A. Art	☐	☐
B. Crafts	☐	☐
C. Health	☐	☐
D. Mathematics	☐	☐
E. Music	☐	☐
F. Physical Education	☐	☐

---

*OTHER refers to other special subjects funded in a particular school district such as phonetics, science, etc.

I. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (Cont'd.)

	Column a Number of Full-Time Certified Teachers	Column b Number of Part-Time Certified Teachers
G. Reading	[ ]	[ ]
H. Special Education	[ ]	[ ]
I. Speech	[ ]	[ ]
J. Other:*____________ Please Specify	[ ]	[ ]
K. Other:*____________ Please Specify	[ ]	[ ]
L. Other:*____________ Please Specify	[ ]	[ ]

4. Were Title I funds for Grades 1 and 2 used in this county during the 1967-1968 school year to purchase TEACHER AIDE services?

   [ ] Yes

   [ ] No

   NOTE: A TEACHER AIDE IS ANY PERSON EMPLOYED TO ASSIST A CERTIFIED TEACHER IN ANY WORK OTHER THAN IN THE ACTUAL PRESENTATION OF SUBJECT MATTER. A TEACHER AIDE IS NOT A CERTIFIED TEACHER.

5. How many FULL-TIME TEACHER AIDES were provided in this county by Title I funds for Grades 1 and 2 during the 1967-1968 school year?

   [ ]

6. How many PART-TIME TEACHER AIDES were provided in this county by Title I funds for Grades 1 and 2 during the 1967-1968 school year?

   [ ]

---

*OTHER refers to other special subjects funded in a particular school district such as phonetics, science, etc.

7. Were Title I funds used in this county to provide EQUIPMENT for Grades 1 and 2 during the 1967-1968 school year?

☐ Yes

☐ No

8. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 7:] During the 1967-1968 school year, what was the total dollar amount of Title I funds spent for the purchase of AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT (including Educational Television Equipment) in Grades 1 and 2 in this county?

$____________________

9. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 7:] Enter in COLUMN "a" the Dollar Amount for Each Type of PHYSICAL EDUCATION EQUIPMENT (including supplies) provided by Title I funds in Grades 1 and 2 of this county during the 1967-1968 school year. In the corresponding space of COLUMN "b", briefly describe the equipment purchased by funds listed in COLUMN "a".

NOTE: IT IS ADEQUATE TO DESCRIBE PHYSICAL EDUCATION EQUIPMENT (INCLUDING SUPPLIES) AS EITHER (1) "PLAYGROUND", (2) "SPORTS" OR (3) "GYMNASIUM". THE CATEGORY OF "PLAYGROUND" INCLUDES ITEMS GENERALLY USED OUT OF DOORS WHICH ARE NOT USED PRIMARILY TO PLAY SPORTS SUCH AS SWINGS, SEESAWS, ROPES, WANDS, ETC. THE CATEGORY OF "SPORTS" INCLUDES ANY PIECE OF EQUIPMENT USED PRIMARILY TO PLAY SPORTS SUCH AS BASKETBALLS, ETC. THE CATEGORY OF "GYMNASIUM" INCLUDES ITEMS USED EXCLUSIVELY IN THE GYMNASIUM WHICH ARE NOT USED PRIMARILY TO PLAY SPORTS SUCH AS TUMBLING MATS, GYM SUITS, ETC. IF ANY PHYSICAL EDUCATION EQUIPMENT WAS PURCHASED WHICH CANNOT BE CLASSIFIED AS "PLAYGROUND", "SPORTS" OR "GYMNASIUM", PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ITEM OR ITEMS IN A FEW WORDS.

Column a DOLLAR AMOUNT SPENT FOR EACH TYPE OF EQUIPMENT	Column b DESCRIPTION OF EQUIPMENT
A. $	
B.	
C.	
D.	
E.	
F.	

I. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (Cont'd.)

10. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 7:] For each subject area listed below, enter in COLUMN "a" the Total Dollar Amount for SPECIAL EQUIPMENT (including supplies) provided by Title I funds in Grades 1 and 2 of this county during the 1967-1968 school year.

NOTE: SPECIAL EQUIPMENT IS ANY EQUIPMENT OTHER THAN PHYSICAL EDUCATION EQUIPMENT WHICH IS USED IN THE PRESENTATION OF SUBJECT MATTER FOR A PARTICULAR SUBJECT AREA. FOR EXAMPLE, SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR MUSIC WOULD INCLUDE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, RHYTHM BAND ITEMS, MUSIC STANDS, ETC. FLASH CARDS AND BLOCK MODELS WOULD BE EXAMPLES OF SPECIAL EQUIPMENT USED IN THE TEACHING OF MATHEMATICS. SPECIAL EQUIPMENT IN THE FIELD OF SPECIAL EDUCATION WOULD INCLUDE ANY MATERIALS SUCH AS FLOOR COUNTING FRAMES, DESIGN OR COUNTING CUBES, SPECIAL FURNITURE, OR ANY OTHER MATERIAL USED TO INSTRUCT CHILDREN PLACED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSES. READING MACHINES AND ALPHABET CARDS WOULD BE EXAMPLES OF SPECIAL EQUIPMENT USED IN THE TEACHING OF READING. EASELS AND PAINT BRUSHES WOULD BE EXAMPLES OF SPECIAL EQUIPMENT USED IN ART.

	Column a TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT SPENT FOR SPECIAL EQUIPMENT
A. Art	$__________
B. Crafts	__________
C. Health	__________
D. Mathematics	__________
E. Music	__________
F. Reading	__________
G. Special Education	__________
H. Speech	__________
I. Other:*__________ Please Specify	__________

---

*OTHER refers to other special subjects funded in a particular school district such as phonetics, science, etc.

I. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (Cont'd.)

10.	Column a TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT SPENT FOR SPECIAL EQUIPMENT
J. Other:*__________ Please Specify	$__________
K. Other:*__________ Please Specify	__________

11. If Title I funds were used in this county to provide TEXTBOOKS, WORKBOOKS, OR PAPERBACK BOOKS, enter in the space corresponding to each subject area listed below the Total Amount Spent For Books in Grades 1 and 2 during the 1967-1968 school year for that subject area listed below.

	Column a TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT SPENT FOR BOOKS
A. Art	$__________
B. Crafts	__________
C. Health	__________
D. Mathematics	__________
E. Music	__________
F. Reading	__________
G. Special Education	__________
H. Speech	__________
I. Other:*__________ Please Specify	__________
J. Other:*__________ Please Specify	__________
K. Other:*__________ Please Specify	__________

---

*OTHER refers to other special subjects funded in a particular school district such as phonetics, science, etc.

II. LIBRARY PROGRAM

12. Were Title I funds provided in this county for a Library Program for the elementary grades during the 1967-1968 school year? [IF "NO", SKIP QUESTIONS 13 THROUGH 21]

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

13. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 12:] Were Title I Library funds for the elementary grades used in this county during the 1967-1968 school year to purchase the services of one or more CERTIFIED LIBRARIANS?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

NOTE: A CERTIFIED LIBRARIAN IS ANY PERSON EMPLOYED TO WORK IN THE LIBRARY WHO HAS CERTIFICATION AS A LIBRARIAN FROM THE KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

14. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 13:] How many FULL-TIME CERTIFIED LIBRARIANS were provided in this county by Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades during the 1967-1968 school year?

[ ]

15. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 13:] How many PART-TIME CERTIFIED LIBRARIANS were provided in this county by Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades during the 1967-1968 school year?

[ ]

16. Were Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades in this county during the 1967-1968 school year used to purchase the services of one or more LIBRARY AIDES?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

NOTE: A LIBRARY AIDE IS ANY PERSON EMPLOYED TO ASSIST A CERTIFIED LIBRARIAN IN WORK IN THE SCHOOL LIBRARY. A LIBRARY AIDE IS NOT A CERTIFIED LIBRARIAN.

17. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 16:] How many FULL-TIME LIBRARY AIDES were provided in this county by Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades during the 1967-1968 school year?

[ ]

II. LIBRARY PROGRAM (Cont'd.)

18. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 16:] How many PART-TIME LIBRARY AIDES were provided in this county by Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades during the 1967-1968 school year?

[ ]

19. What was the total amount of Title I Library Program funds spent in this county for the purchase of LIBRARY BOOKS for Grades 1 and 2 during the 1967-1968 school year?

$________________

20. What was the total amount of Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades spent in this county during the 1967-1968 school year for the purchase of LIBRARY EQUIPMENT (NOT INCLUDING BOOKS)?

$________________

NOTE: LIBRARY EQUIPMENT (NOT INCLUDING BOOKS) REFERS TO ITEMS PURCHASED AS PART OF THE PERMANENT EQUIPMENT OF THE LIBRARY SUCH AS CARD CATALOGS, BOOK SHELVES, FURNITURE, ETC.

21. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 20:] What was the total amount of Title I Library Program funds for the elementary grades spent in this county for the purchase of OTHER LIBRARY MATERIAL (NOT INCLUDING BOOKS OR EQUIPMENT) during the 1967-1968 school year?

$________________

NOTE: OTHER LIBRARY MATERIAL (NOT INCLUDING BOOKS OR EQUIPMENT) REFERS TO ALL EXPENDABLE MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES USED IN THE ORDINARY OPERATION OF LIBRARY FACILITIES SUCH AS BOOKPOCKETS, LIBRARY CARDS, STAMP PAD, DATE STAMP, PENCILS, ETC.

APPENDIX B.
Household Conditions Rating Scales

I. HOUSING SCALES

1. Is the dwelling structurally sound?

DILAPIDATED DETERIORATING SOUND

2. Adequacy of heat and ventilation in dwelling:	YES	NO
A. Is heat available for each of the inhabited rooms?	☐	☐
B. Are there any apparent heating hazards? If yes, specify. ______________________________ ______________________________	☐	☐
C. Does the roof leak?	☐	☐
D. Do each of the inhabited rooms in this dwelling contain at least one operable window?	☐	☐
E. Are there two or more broken window panes in this dwelling? (Disregard cracked windows in answering this question.)	☐	☐

On the basis of answers to the above questions the overall adequacy of the heating and ventilation in this dwelling may be characterized as:

INADEQUATE MINIMALLY ADEQUATE OPTIMALLY ADEQUATE

3. Adequacy of plumbing facilities:	YES	NO
A. Does the dwelling contain cold running water?	☐	☐
B. Does the dwelling contain hot running water?	☐	☐
C. Is there at least one flush toilet in operable condition in the dwelling?	☐	☐
D. Is there a kitchen sink in working condition?	☐	☐

	YES	NO
3. E. Is there a lavatory in working condition?	☐	☐
F. Is there a bathtub or shower in working condition?	☐	☐

On the basis of answers to the above questions the plumbing facilities in this dwelling may be characterized as:

INADEQUATE   MINIMALLY ADEQUATE   OPTIMALLY ADEQUATE

4. Adequacy of cooking equipment:	YES	NO
A. Does dwelling contain a stove (three or more burner unit plus oven) in working condition?	☐	☐
B. Is the stove operated by electricity or by gas?	☐	☐
C. If the family does not have a kitchen range, do they have an electric broiler-over and a three or more burner hot plate in working condition?	☐	☐

On the basis of answers to the above questions the adequacy of the cooking equipment may be characterized as:

INADEQUATE   MINIMALLY ADEQUATE   OPTIMALLY ADEQUATE

5. Adequacy of person per room ratio:

A. How many people live in this dwelling? Consider all persons who live and eat with the family as residents. ☐☐

B. How many rooms are there in the house excluding the bathroom and including the kitchen? ☐☐

PPR ☐☐.☐

Person per room ratio for this dwelling may be characterized as:

INADEQUATE   MINIMALLY ADEQUATE   OPTIMALLY ADEQUATE

6. Adequacy of protection from rodents and flying and crawling insects:

	YES	NO
A. Do the openable windows in the inhabited rooms of this dwelling have screens?	☐	☐
B. Are there screens for the doors which are ordinarily used for entrance and exit from this dwelling?	☐	☐
C. Are the houses which have basement windows or crawl space or air space below the first floor supplied with screens or built so as to prevent the entry of rodents?	☐	☐
D. Have you had any trouble with rodents (excluding mice) inside the house?	☐	☐
E. Have you had any trouble with mice inside the house?	☐	☐

On the basis of answers to the above questions the adequacy of protection from rodents and flying and crawling insects in this dwelling may be characterized as:

INADEQUATE

MINIMALLY ADEQUATE

OPTIMALLY ADEQUATE

NUTRITION

I would like for you to tell us about everything in the way of food and drink that was served in your home yesterday. If you were out of the home at all yesterday, please tell us everything that you or the children had to eat or drink while you were gone. Include snacks and drinks of all kinds.

First of all, what time did the family get up yesterday?__________

Was it the usual time? YES NO If no, why not?______________

____

When was the first time food or drink was served in the home yesterday? Tell me everything that was served in as much detail as you can.* Did everyone eat (or drink) some of this?*

When was the next time food was served?*__________________________

What was served?* Did everyone eat (or drink) some of this?*

What else was served yesterday?* Did everyone eat (or drink) some of this?*

Was there anything else that anybody in the family had to eat or drink that you haven't mentioned?*

Were you home all day yesterday? YES NO If no, "Did you have anything to eat or drink while you were gone?" YES NO If yes, what was it?*

Are these the kinds of foods that you usually serve in the home? YES NO If no, explain______________________________________

Was there anything special about the foods served yesterday? YES NO If yes, explain______________________________________

____

What are the family's favorite foods?**

What are their favorite drinks?**

Did anybody take vitamins or minerals yesterday? YES NO If yes, who? What kind were taken?**

If the respondent says they have vitamins or minerals but didn't take any yesterday, list the kind of vitamins or mineral supplements in the home:____

---

*Record answers on page 2-N.

**Record answers on page 3-N.

NUTRITION (PAGE 2-N)

AMOUNT	FOOD	WHERE EATEN	TIME	NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS SERVED*

*Put check-mark in appropriate space if food was eaten by all family members.

NUTRITION (PAGE 3-N)

FAMILY'S FAVORITE FOODS	FAMILY'S FAVORITE DRINKS

VITAMINS AND MINERALS	IDENTITY (AGE-SEX) OF MEMBERS TAKING SUPPLEMENT	CORRESPONDING QUANTITY OF SUPPLEMENT CONSUMED

PERSONAL CLEANLINESS AND HYGIENE SCALE

		YES	NO
1.	Is the children's apparel in good repair?	☐	☐
2.	Does the children's hair look like it has been combed or brushed recently?	☐	☐
3.	Do the children's hands and faces appear to be clean?	☐	☐
4.	Do the children's ears, necks and hair appear to be clean?	☐	☐
5.	How often are the children given a bath?*	At Least Once A Week ☐	Less Than Once A Week ☐
6.	Is the children's apparel appropriate for the season?**	☐	☐
7.	On the whole, is the children's clothing clean?	☐	☐
8.	Is the parents' apparel in good repair?	☐	☐
9.	Does the parents' hair look like it has been combed or brushed recently?	☐	☐
10.	Do the parents' hands and faces appear to be clean?	☐	☐
11.	Do the parents' ears, necks and hair appear to be clean?	☐	☐
12.	Is the parents' clothing clean?	☐	☐
13.	Does each person have his own eating utensils, including a glass or cup, a dish or plate, and a fork or spoon?	☐	☐

---

* "More than once a week" is the positive response for this item and should be scored according.

** If the response is "no", find out whether: [Place check in appropriate box]

a) Children do not possess apparel appropriate for the season. ☐

or

b) Children possess appropriate apparel but simply are not wearing it. ☐

SANITATION AND SAFETY SCALES

		YES	NO
1.	Is the yard surrounding the home free of hazards to children?	☐	☐
2.	Is there electricity in the house?	☐	☐
3.	Are there any loose boards or holes in the floor?	☐	☐

ADEQUACY OF WASTE DISPOSAL

4.	How often is the garbage disposed of?	At Least Once A Day	Less Than Once A Day	
5.	Is the method of disposing of garbage adequate?		☐	☐
6.	Is there a flush toilet in working condition?		☐	☐
7.	Is the location of its outlet sanitary?		☐	☐
8.	Does it appear to be clean?		☐	☐
6a.	Is there an outhouse?		☐	☐
7a.	Is the location of its outlet sanitary?		☐	☐
8a.	Does its construction meet the minimum standards for sanitation and does it appear to be clean?		☐	☐

ADEQUACY OF WATER SUPPLY

		YES	NO
9.	Is the source of drinking water adequate?	☐	☐
	Enumerate source:________________________		
10.	Is there adequate water for bathing within 50 feet of the dwelling (other than a creek)?	☐	☐

ADEQUACY OF FOOD STORAGE METHODS

		YES	NO
11.	Is there a refrigerator, ice box, or home freezer in working condition?	☐	☐
11a.	If no electricity, is there a springhouse?	☐	☐
12.	Are dry foods kept in closed containers (e.g., box or canisters)?	☐	☐

SANITATION AND SAFETY SCALES (PAGE 2)

CLEANLINESS OF HOUSE

		YES	NO
13.	Is there paper, garbage or other debris scattered around the house?	☐	☐
14.	Are dirty dishes piled up in the kitchen? (Disregard if there are less than five dishes.)	☐	☐
15.	Do the floors appear to have been swept recently?	☐	☐
16.	Are there any farm animals kept in the house?	☐	☐
17.	If a dog or a cat is kept inside, is their waste properly disposed of?*	☐	☐

---

*NOTE: Is there a dog or cat kept in the house?

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS SCALE RESPONDENTS

Name of Interviewer______________________ Date of Interview__________

Person Accompanying Interviewer____________________ ______________
Name Position

Primary Respondent(s)____________________________ Sex_____ Race______
Last First Middle

Other Respondent_________________________________ Sex_____ Race______

Family ID#*__________ County__________ Original Date of Intake*________

Total Number of Visits (by Homemaker, Case Aide, or both) to Date*_____

Number of Children Currently Attending Day Care** ________

From Observation, Note the Number of Adults (persons over 18 years of age) Including the Respondent(s) at Home During the Interview*** ______

From Observation, Note the Number of Children at Home During the Interview ________

ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW:

I noticed that there are ________ children at home today.
How old is each of these children?______________________________

	YES	NO
Do you raise a garden?	☐	☐
Do you receive food stamps?	☐	☐
Do you rent this house?****	☐	☐
Do you own this house?****	☐	☐
Do you receive Public Assistance?		

---

*NOTE: To be filled out in Central Office from RCC-04 Homemaker Service Family Card or Case Aide Service Family Card.

**NOTE: To be filled out in Central Office from KCWRF #74 Notice of Change in Day Care Roster.

***If there is a person whose age you cannot ascertain by observation, ask the respondent: "How old is he (or she)?"

****NOTE: BE SURE TO ASK: "IS THIS THE SAME HOUSE YOU WERE LIVING IN DURING FEBRUARY, 1968?" YES ☐ NO ☐

APPENDIX C.
Criteria for Household Conditions Ratings

I. CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING ADEQUACY OF HOUSING CONDITIONS

NOTE: We plan to use a three point rating scale to rate the adequacy of the following housing conditions. The three points on our scale will be labeled "inadequate", "minimally adequate" and "optimally adequate."

1. We plan to use the census criteria and the census rating scale to rate adequacy of the structural dwelling (Enumerator's Reference Manuals, 1960 U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing).

2. Adequacy of heating and ventilation:

   Inadequate would be defined by absence of heat in the inhabited rooms of the house or by less than one operable window per inhabited room in the house (exclude bathrooms, halls and pantries when computing window per room ratio) or by the combination of any two of the following conditions: (1) one or more heating hazards*; (2) leaky roof; (3) two or more broken window panes (exclude cracks).

   Minimally adequate would be defined by one of the following conditions: (1) one or more apparent heating hazards or (2) a leaky roof or (3) two or more broken window panes (exclude cracks).

   Optimally adequate would be defined by (1) heat in the inhabited rooms; (2) a sound roof (no leaks); (3) no apparent heating hazards; (4) at least one operable window in each inhabited room of the house (excluding bathrooms, halls and pantries).

   *NOTE: Examples of heating hazards are unprotected fireplaces (no fire screen), leaking gas heaters, unvented heaters, makeshift chimneys, etc.

3. Adequacy of plumbing facilities:

   Inadequate would be defined as a structure that does not contain a flush toilet in working condition plus one other convenience in working condition (e.g., The plumbing facilities would be rated as inadequate if there were no running water of any kind or no flush toilet and one other convenience in working condition or a flush toilet only).

   Minimally adequate would be defined as cold running water with operable flush toilet and one other convenience in working condition.

   Optimally adequate would consist of a sink, hot and cold running water, a flush toilet and a tub or shower--all in working condition.

4. Cooking equipment:

Inadequate: no stove (3 burners plus oven) in working condition. For example, if the house contains a hot plate only in operable condition, this would be deemed inadequate.

Minimally adequate: wood, coal, oil or kerosene stove in working condition.

Optimally adequate: an electric or gas (utility or bottle) range in working condition.

NOTE: In order to be judged optimally adequate, an electric or gas range must have three burners and an oven in operable condition. If the family has no electric or gas range but has the following conveniences they are to be considered minimally adequate: electric broiler-over plus hot plate with three burners in working condition.

5. Person per room adequacy:

Inadequate: more than 1.0 persons per room.

Minimally adequate: .5 to 1.0 persons per room.

Optimally adequate: less than .5 person per room.

6. Adequacy of protection from flying and crawling insects and rodents:

Inadequate would be defined by a rat problem (always inadequate) or by the combination of any two of the following conditions: (1) no screens; (2) inadequate protection in air space; (3) roach problem or problem with other crawling insects (e.g., bed-bugs) or (4) mouse problem.

Minimally adequate: (1) no screens but no other problems; or (2) inadequate protection in air space but no other problems; or (3) roach problem or problem with other crawling insects (e.g., bed-bugs); or (4) mouse problem only.

Optimally adequate is defined by the absence of all of these problems.

II. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING ADEQUACY OF NUTRITION

Ratings: The adequacy of nutrition will be judged by a consultant using three 3-point rating scales. Specifically, it is proposed that the adequacy of nutrition be evaluated on the basis of ratings of the nutritional values of (1) proteins, (2) fresh fruits and vegetables, and (3) other food-stuffs (e.g., cereal and grain products) served in the home during the 24-hour recall period. The end-points of the rating scales employed will be labeled "unsatisfactory" and "satisfactory" respectively, whereas the middle category of the scales will be unlabeled.

Scoring: The score for a given household will be the sum of the values assigned for each of the three rating scales described above. Since the categories labeled "unsatisfactory" and "satisfactory" will be assigned values of 1 and 3, respectively, the minimum score possible on nutritional adequacy will be 3 with the maximum score possible being 9.

III. GUIDELINES FOR PERSONAL CLEANLINESS AND HYGIENE SCALE

1. Is the children's apparel in good repair?

   Examples of conditions which would qualify for inclusion in the "no" category:

   Clothing visibly torn or tattered; more than one button missing on shirts, trousers, coats and jackets; zippers not functioning; safety pins or pins used to replace buttons or zippers; large holes in mittens or gloves; holes in shoes or shoes otherwise badly run down.

2. Does the children's hair look like it has been combed or brushed recently?

   Look particularly for knots and tangles in hair. A good guide would be whether or not a comb would pass easily through the hair. Look also for heavily soiled condition of the hair and evidence of vermin.

3. Do the children's hands and faces appear to be clean?

   Here the distinction should be between dirt and other unhygienic substances which have been acquired recently which the parents might have removed given a few spare minutes, and chronic condition of filth. Sources of filth would be dirt, food, fecal matter, urine stains, coal dust, etc. Children whose skin appears grey (denoting a condition of long duration and general pervasiveness) should be distinguished from those dirty only in spots.

4. Do the children's ears, necks and hair appear to be clean?

   Here again we are interested in chronic rather than acute conditions. Ears which are dirty enough to constitute a health hazard should be noted. Necks with generally dirty appearance should be distinguished from those dirty only in spots. Hair with caked dirt or food particles should be noted. Presence or symptoms of vermin should also be noted.

5. How often are the children given a bath?

   Answers to this item should be obtained by direct questioning of the parents. It is important to stress that by "given a bath" we mean the overall cleansing of the child's body and not merely the cleasing of his hands and face. If possible, find out how the child is bathed--i.e., whether he is immersed in the bath water or whether he is given a "sponge-bath". Incomplete or partial cleansing would be more likely in the case where the latter method is used.

6. Is the children's apparel appropriate for the season?

   During the winter months, "appropriate apparel" would consist of conventional warm clothing (e.g., sweaters, long-sleeved shirts, blouses, dresses or jumpers; socks; long trousers for men and boys over the age of 18 months; socks; winter shoes such as oxfords or loafers; etc.) provided the children are seen indoors--unless the house is very well-heated and free of drafts. If the children are seen outdoors during cold weather, they should be wearing winter coats (or jackets); mittens or gloves; scarfs, hats or ear-muffs; and heavy shoes and socks. In the case where there is heavy precipitation on the ground, the child who is seen outdoors should be wearing boots or galoshes.

During the late spring months (provided the weather is seasonal), appropriate apparel would consist of clothing (dresses; blouses and skirts; trousers; polo shirts; etc.) made of such light-weight materials as cotton, linen, cotton jersey, etc. Canvas or "tennis" shoes as well as loafers or oxfords would be considered appropriate. The child should be wearing a sweater or light-weight jacket or coat when seen outdoors unless the weather is unseasonably warm. If it is raining, the child seen outdoors should be wearing a raincoat and hat or he should be protected by an umbrella.

In general, apparel should be appropriate to the temperature of the environment in which the child is seen and not merely to the season of the year.

7. On the whole, is the children's clothing clean?

Here the distinction should be between dirt and other unhygienic substances which have been acquired during the day and chronic condition of filth. (See guidelines for #3 above.)

8-12. Items 8-12 concerning cleanliness of the parents correspond to the preceding items 1-7. Thus guidelines similar to those outlined above for children's cleanliness should be used.

13. Does each person have his own eating utensils, including a glass or cup, a dish or plate, and a fork or spoon?

This item can be answered by questioning the parents directly. In the event that the parents refuse to supply answers to this item, the Homemaker or caseworker may be used as a source of information.

NOTE: With the exception of items 5 and 13 the evaluation of items pertaining to Personal Cleanliness will be based on direct observation. Items 5 and 13 will be answered by questioning the parents.

Scoring: Scoring will be accomplished by assigning a weight of "2" to each "yes" and to the response "at least once a week" for item 5 and a weight of "1" to each "no" response and to the response "less than once a week" for item 5. A household's score on overall personal cleanliness would simply be the sum across all items of the weights of the appropriate responses. The maximum possible score on this problem area would be 26, whereas the minimum possible would be 13.

IV. SANITATION AND SAFETY GUIDELINES

1. Is the yard surrounding the home free of hazards to children?

   Hazards to look for include metal scrap; broken glass; discarded appliances, such as a refrigerator, in which a child could become trapped; slag heaps; open holes, ditches or wells, etc.

2. Is there electricity in the house?

   This item can easily be answered on the basis of direct observation.

3. Are there any loose boards or holes in the floor?

   This item can also be answered on the basis of direct observation.

4. How often is the garbage disposed of?

   Garbage should be removed from the home and disposed of at least once per day.

5. Is the method of disposing of garbage adequate?

   There are two methods of garbage disposal that may be considered adequate: Garbage should be disposed of by burial in a sanitary land fill, which should be located at least 50 feet from the water supply or it should be burned and the residue buried.

6. Is there a flush toilet in working condition?
   and

6a. Is there an outhouse?

   These items should be answered on the basis of direct observation.

7. Is the location of its outlet sanitary?

   A flush toilet should empty into a public sewer or septic tank. In no event should it contaminate the water supply.

8. Does it appear to be clean?

   The water closet, including all fixtures therein, should be kept clean, in good repair and free from dust, dirt, insects and other contamination.

7a. Is the location of its outlet sanitary?

The pit should not be located within 50 feet of any source of water supply. On sloping ground it should be located at a lower elevation than the water supply. On level ground the area around both privy and water supply should be mounted with earth.

8a. Does its construction meet the minimum standards for sanitation and does it appear to be clean?

A most important consideration in the construction of an outhouse is its location. If the answer to 7a above is "no", then the outhouse is to be considered as improperly constructed and 8a would be answered "no" also.

In addition to location, the following standards for construction should have been observed:

1) The floor and seat riser should be constructed so as to exclude insects and rodents.

2) Each seat opening should be provided with a hinged lid, which should be kept closed when the facilities are not being used.

3) The superstructure of the privy should be constructed of substantial material fastened solidly to the floor. It should have either a shed roof sloped to the rear or a gable roof sloped to each side, and the roof should be water-tight.

4) Pit mounds should be thoroughly tamped, and mounds should be protected from erosion.

5) The seat riser should be so constructed and bonded with the floor as to prevent seepage through the riser onto the floor.

CLEANLINESS

1) The seat, floor and the ground area immediately surrounding the privy should be clean.

2) The pit should be kept fly-tight. (The lid or seat covers should be closed when not in use; the hinges and lids should be kept in good repair; and openings or crevices leading to the pit should be blocked.)

3) The pit should not be filled to more than 18 inches from the floor.

SANITATION AND SAFETY GUIDELINES (PAGE 3)

9. Is the source of drinking water adequate?

   In order to be judged adequate drinking water must be obtained from a cistern, a public system or private company, or a spring. The water source should not be located within 50 feet of any sanitary land fill, pit privy or sewage outlet.

10. Is there adequate water for bathing within 50 feet of the dwelling (other than a creek)?

    If a cistern, well or spring is located within 50 feet of the dwelling or if the dwelling is supplied with running water, the answer to this item is "yes". Otherwise, the answer is "no".

11-17. Items 11-17 are fairly straight-forward and may be answered on the basis of direct observation.

Scoring: For items 1, 2, 5, 6 through 11 (or 6a through 11a), 15 and 17, a "yes" response will be assigned a weight of "2" and a "no" response will be assigned a weight of "1". For items 3, 13, 14 and 16, the weights must be reversed for purposes of scoring. Finally, the response "At Least Once A Day" to item 4 will be assigned a weight of "2", whereas the response "Less Than Once A Day" will be assigned a weight of "1". Total score on Sanitation and Safety would be the sum of the weights of the responses for each of the items. The maximum score possible on this area would be 34.

APPENDIX D.
Household Conditions Rating Survey
(Interview Form)

PROCEDURE FOR INTERVIEWING AND RECORDING RESPONSES TO HOUSEHOLD RATING SURVEY

I. PROCEDURE FOR ORIENTING HOMEMAKER OR CASE AIDE TO HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

A. Be sure to cover the following points with your Homemaker or Case Aide before you leave the office.

1. Give your Homemaker or Case Aide a general idea of what you are going to be doing in the homes. You might say something like the following:

> "The first thing we are going to do when we get in the home is ask the parents some questions. The first questions I'll ask them will be about the kinds of foods they had yesterday. After we finish asking all the questions, then we'll ask for the parents to take us to see the kitchen. After we have been to see the kitchen we'll ask them to show us the bathroom or outhouse. The last thing we'll do before leaving is to walk around the outside of the house if the parents don't object."

2. Tell your Case Aide or Homemaker to act as natural as possible. She can chat with the respondent and interpret questions, if necessary. There are only two things to caution the Case Aide or Homemaker about: a) She is not to prompt the respondent and b) She is not to contradict the respondent if he gives a false answer. If the respondent gives a false answer, then the Homemaker or Case Aide should tell you about it after you have left the home.

3. Emphasize to the Homemaker or Case Aide that she is to accompany you into each home and that she is to stay with you at all times. (e.g., When you go to see the outhouse, she is to go see the outhouse too.)

4. Tell your Homemaker or Case Aide in advance the names of those families you want her to take you to see on that particular day. Let her choose the route and consequently the order in which you will see the families. Make sure that she really is the assigned Homemaker (or Case Aide) for these particular families.

5. Ask about any families that might be hard to see or who might object to being interviewed. Make sure before you leave the office that you ask the Homemaker or Case Aide:

a) if she knows of any reason(s) why any of the families might not be at home at the time you plan to visit them; and b) how much time will be involved in traveling to see each of the families.

NOTE: First visit those families who are most likely to cooperate and who live in relatively accessible areas. Then, if you have any time left, see those families who live in the more remote areas and/or those whom the Homemaker or Case Aide thinks might prove to be uncooperative.

NOTE: The person who accompanies you to the home of any family should always be the family's own (i.e., assigned) Homemaker (or Case Aide). If any corrections or revisions need to be made in your list of families to be seen, always contact Miss Briscoe before you act on these corrections.

II. PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO GAINING ADMISSION TO THE HOUSE

A. Ask the Homemaker or Case Aide in advance who will accompany you to the home to:

1. Be the one to make the initial approach to the family (e.g., She should be the one who knocks on the door).
2. Introduce you to the mother and/or father (i.e., the adult(s) present in the home at the time).
3. Explain to the mother and/or father that:
    - a. you work with her for the day care program
    - b. you're in the county visiting some of the Project families
    - c. you'll explain why you're visiting this person's home.

B. Illustration

Homemaker or Case Aide:

> "Mrs. __________, I've got somebody here I want you to meet! This is Mrs. _____________, who is visiting some of our Project families with me today here in _________ County. Mrs. ____________ is a member of our Day Care Program Research Office, and I'll let her tell you what we're doing here today and what we'd like to talk to you about."

C. You then would introduce the Respondent to the topics that will be covered in the survey, using the prepared introduction. You would start with "Mrs. ______________ and I are doing a special census. . . ." if the Homemaker or Case Aide had followed the procedure illustrated above in introducing you to the Respondent.

D. If the Respondent says categorically that it is not okay with her for you to see the kitchen and the toilet facilities, then you should smile and say:

> "Well, Mrs. ____________, I'm awfully glad you told us how you feel because we certainly don't want to do anything that will inconvenience you or disturb you. However, if you change your mind and decide later on that you would like to participate in our survey, you let Mrs. __________ here know and perhaps we can come back to see you. Otherwise, we won't bother you anymore with this. Okay? [PAUSE] "It was nice meeting you. Good-bye."

E. For all other respondents (i.e., those who say it's okay with them), immediately after you give the prepared introduction you should say:

> "Now we're not going to ask you anything that's difficult or embarrassing or anything like that. We're just going to ask you questions like what kind of food you had for dinner yesterday, and whether anybody in the family takes vitamins. In fact, why don't we start with the questions about foods and vitamins if that's all right with you. . . [PAUSE] Let's see, I've got several questions here about foods." [TURN TO SECTION III]

RESPONDENT'S NAME ______________________ FAMILY I.D. NO. __________

COUNTY ________________ INTERVIEWER ______________ DATE ___________

III. PROCEDURE FOR INTERVIEWING THE RESPONDENT

Question 1. [*RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 2-N]

*a. "First of all, could you tell me, when was the first time food or drink was served in the home yesterday?"

*b. "Tell me everything that was served in as much detail as you can."

*c. "Did everyone eat or drink some of this?"

*d. [IF NO] "How many people ate (or drank) some of this?"

e. "How long was it after the family got up yesterday before they had anything to eat?" [RECORD ANSWER BELOW] __________________

____

f. "So the family got up at what--about 7 (or 8, or 9) o'clock?" [RECORD ANSWER BELOW] ______________________________

g. "Was this the usual time for getting up?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

h. [IF NO] "Well, could you tell me what time the family ordinarily gets up in the morning?" [RECORD ANSWER BELOW] ____________

____

Question 2. [RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 2-N]

a. "When was the next time food was served?"

b. "What was served?"

c. "How many people ate each of the foods you've mentioned?"

Question 3. [RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 2-N]

a. "What else was served yesterday?"

b. "What time was that?"

c. "How many people ate (or drank) the foods served at that meal?"

Question 4. [RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 2-N]

a. "Was there anything else that anybody in the family had to eat or drink that you haven't already told me about?"

b. [IF YES] "What time was that?"

c. [IF YES] "How many people ate or drank some of this?"

Question 5.

a. "Were you home all day yesterday?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

b. [IF NO] "Did you have anything to eat or drink while you were gone?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO CAN'T REMEMBER

c. [RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 2-N]

[IF YES, ASK:] "What was it?"

"What time was it?"

"Did any of the other family members eat out with you?"

"Did they eat the same thing that you did?"

Question 6.

a. "Are the foods you've mentioned the kinds you usually eat when you're here at home?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

b. [IF NO, ASK:] "Could you tell me what sorts of foods you usually have to eat?" [RECORD ANSWER BELOW] ______ ______________

____

____

____

Question 7.

a. "Was there anything special about the foods served yesterday?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

b. [IF YES] "Oh, was it somebody's birthday. . . or what?"

[RECORD ANSWER BELOW] ______________________________

____

____

Question 8. [RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 3-N]

a. "I wonder if you'd mind telling me what your family's favorite foods are?"

b. "What about the family's favorite drinks?"

Question 9.

a. "Did anybody in the family take vitamins or minerals or any kind of food supplements yesterday?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO DON'T KNOW

b. [RECORD ANSWERS-NUTRITION PAGE 3-N]

[IF YES] "Could you tell me what kind of food supplements were taken and who took them?"

c. "I need to know all the different kinds of vitamins and minerals that you have here in the home even if nobody takes them. . ." [RECORD ANSWER BELOW] ______________________________

____

Question 10.

a. "Have you ever raised a garden?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

b. "Do you plan to raise a garden this year?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO DON'T KNOW

c. "Does your family receive food stamps?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 11.

"Do you have enough eating utensils to go around so that each family member has his own cup or glass, dish or plate, and fork or spoon?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 12.

a. "Do you have access to some kind of garbage disposal service or do you have to dispose of your own garbage and trash?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] SERVICE NO SERVICE

b. "How often do you carry out the trash or garbage?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] AT LEAST ONCE A DAY LESS THAN ONCE A DAY

c. [IF APPLICABLE] "You said that you have to dispose of the garbage yourself. How do you take care of this problem?"

[RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] ______________________________

____

____

Question 13.

a. "Where do you get your drinking water?" [RECORD RESPONSE BELOW]* ______________________________

*NOTE: How far is the source of the drinking water from the house?

____

b. [IF NO PLUMBING, ASK:] "What about water for bathing or washing? Do you get that from the same place?" [RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] ______________________________

c. "About how often do your children get a bath?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK LESS THAN ONCE A WEEK

d. "How many children are at home today?" [RECORD RESPONSE] ______

e. "Would you mind telling me the ages of each of these children?"

[RECORD RESPONSES] ______________________________

Question 14.

[IF RESPONDENT INDICATED ABOVE FOR QUESTION 13A THAT THE FAMILY HAS RUNNING WATER, ASK:]

a. "Do you have hot running water as well as cold running water?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

b. "What kind of plumbing facilities do you have?" [CIRCLE ANSWERS]

(1)	"Do you have a kitchen sink with running water?"	YES	NO
(2)	"Do you have a bathtub?"	YES	NO
(3)	"Do you have a shower?"	YES	NO
(4)	"Do you have a flush toilet?"	YES	NO
(5)	"Do you have a lavoratory or sink in your bathroom?"	YES	NO
(6)	"Do you have any other plumbing facilities?"		

[RECORD RESPONSE] ______________________________

c. "Are all of the plumbing facilities you've mentioned in working condition?" [CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

d. [IF NO] "Which ones are not in working condition?"

[RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] ______________________________

____

e. "Do you have a septic tank?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 15.

a. [ASK IF NECESSARY] "Do you have electricity?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

b. "What kinds of kitchen appliances do you have?" [CIRCLE ANSWERS]

(1) "Do you have a refrigerator?" YES NO

(2) "Do you have a freezer?" YES NO

(3) "Do you have an ice box?" YES NO

(4) "Do you have an electric range?" YES NO

(5) "Do you have a gas range?" YES NO

(6) "Do you have a kerosene or coal oil stove?" YES NO

(7) "Do you have a coal or wood stove?" YES NO

(8) "Do you have an electric broiler oven?" YES NO

(9) "Do you have a three-burner hot plate?" YES NO

c. "Are all of the kitchen appliances you've mentioned in working condition?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

d. [IF NO] "Which ones are not in working condition?"

[RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] ______________________________

____

e. "Do you happen to have a springhouse?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 16.

"How do you store dry foods like sugar, flour and corn meal?"

[RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] ______________________________

Question 17.

a. "Do you feel that your family has enough winter (or spring) clothing to wear?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

b. [IF NO] "Do you think that you could use some help in obtaining more clothing for your family?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

Question 18.

a. "How many people live here with you?"* [RECORD RESPONSE] _______

*ENTER TOTAL NUMBER OF RESIDENTS, INCLUDING RESPONDENT(S).

b. "Are all of these people members of your family?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

c. [IF NO] "How many people live here with you who aren't family members? Are they boarders. . . or what?" [RECORD RESPONSES BELOW]

____

Question 19.

a. "How many rooms are there in this house, not counting the kitchen (and the bathroom, if any)?" [RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] _____

b. "Do you use all of these rooms for living purposes?"

[CIRCLE ANSWER] YES NO

c. "Do all of the rooms have windows that can be opened and closed?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

d. "Do you have screens for all of the windows that can be opened?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

e. "What about the door(s)? Do you have screens for all of the doors that are ordinarily used for going in and out of the house?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

f. "Do you rent this house or own it?"

[RECORD RESPONSE BELOW] ____________________________________

Question 20.

a. "How do you heat the house in the winter?" [RECORD RESPONSE IN DETAIL BELOW] ____________________________________

b. "Are there any rooms that you use on an everyday basis, excluding the bathroom, that don't have a direct heat source, such as a fireplace or portable electric or gas heater?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 21.

a. "Have you had any trouble with the roof leaking?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

b. [IF YES] "Is it still leaking?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 22.

a. "What about the foundation? Have you had any trouble with the floor settling or anything like that?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

b. [IF YES] "Have you been able to get this fixed?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

Question 23.

"Have you had any trouble with pests such as rats, mice, squirrels or snakes getting into the house?"*

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO

*NOTE: BE SURE TO CIRCLE THE TYPE OF PEST INFESTING THE HOME.

Question 24.

"I just have two more questions and then I wonder if you'd mind showing me the kitchen."

a. "Do you feel that your family could benefit from some kind of public assistance or welfare allotment?"

[CIRCLE RESPONSE] YES NO ALREADY RECEIVE PA

b. [IF NECESSARY, ASK:] "Have you ever applied for such assistance or are you now receiving assistance?" [RECORD RESPONSE BELOW]

END OF INTERVIEW SECTION

IV. PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING THE VISIT

A. REQUEST FOR TOUR OF KITCHEN

"Well, that's all of the questions I've got. I certainly do thank you for taking the time to answer them. I wonder if you might let us see your kitchen or the place where you cook your meals now and then next your (bathroom) [OR] (outhouse)."

B. KITCHEN OBSERVATIONS - MENTALLY NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

1. TYPE OF RANGE - Number of burners
2. FOOD STORAGE APPLIANCES (Refrigerator, Freezer, Ice Box)
3. DRY FOOD STORAGE METHODS - Dry foods stored in boxes or cans?
4. WINDOWS IN KITCHEN - Number; whether openable; presence of screens; cracks or breaks.
5. PLUMBING FACILITIES - Kitchen sink; hot water heater
6. FLOOR - Any holes or weak spots? Floor "sunken"? Cleanliness?
7. CEILING - Discoloration? Structural defects?
8. TYPE OF WALL COVERING - Structural defects?
9. NUMBER AND TYPE OF EATING UTENSILS ON DISPLAY
10. DIRTY DISHES - Five or more? (Include forks, spoons, knives, pots and pans in counting.)
11. GENERAL APPEARANCE - Loose paper, garbage, debris in evidence?

12. PRESENCE OF FARM OR OTHER ANIMALS

C. TOUR OF BATHROOM OR OUTHOUSE - [NOTE: IF THE RESPONDENT HAS NO INDOOR PLUMBING AND NO OUTHOUSE, OMIT THIS SECTION!]

"Could we see the (outhouse) [OR] (bathroom) now? Then, next, if you don't mind, we'd like to walk around the exterior of the house and that will complete our survey."

D. BATHROOM OR OUTHOUSE OBSERVATIONS - MENTALLY NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

1. NUMBER AND TYPE OF PLUMBING FACILITIES -
    a. Is there a flush toilet in working condition?
    b. Is there an outhouse?
2. OUTLET - Location sanitary?
    a. Flush toilet - septic tank or sewer?
    b. Location of outhouse outlet in relation to water supply.
3. OUTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION - Floor and seat riser; seat lid; superstructure and roof; pit mound; seepage hazards.
4. CLEANLINESS AND SANITATION
    a. Flush toilet - Dust, dirt, insects and other contamination.
    b. Outhouse - Cleanliness of seat, floor and area surrounding privy; protection from flies. Is pit filled to within more than 18 inches from the floor?

E. TOUR OF EXTERIOR OF DWELLING

"Now, if you don't mind, as we leave we'd like to just walk around the outside of the house." [IF RESPONDENT ASKS WHY, SAY: "WE JUST WANT TO LOOK AT THE FOUNDATION AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE BUILDING."] "I certainly do thank you for talking with us this morning and for letting us visit you. We'll be doing surveys like this from time to time in the future, and we might like to come back and visit with you again if you don't have any objections. . ."

F. EXTERIOR OF HOUSE AND YARD OBSERVATIONS - MENTALLY NOTE THE FOLLOWING: [WARNING: DO NOT ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT OR APPROACH ANY OUTBUILDINGS OTHER THAN THE OUTHOUSE!]

1. CONDITION OF HOUSE - Is it

NOTE: Source- Census Criteria

a. Dilapidated - so that it no longer provides adequate shelter?

b. Deteriorating - so that it needs more repair than would be provided in the course of regular maintenance?

c. or Sound?

2. CRAWL SPACE BELOW HOUSE - Enclosed or not?

3. YARD HAZARDS - Metal scrap; broken glass; discarded appliances in which a child could become entrapped; slag heaps; open holes, ditches or wells; etc.

G. OTHER OBSERVATIONS - MENTALLY NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

1. CLEANLINESS OF CHILDREN PRESENT DURING INTERVIEW

2. CLEANLINESS OF ADULTS PRESENT DURING INTERVIEW
3. CLOTHING OF CHILDREN AND PARENTS - Appropriate to season; cleanliness; state of repair.
4. GENERAL CLEANLINESS OF HOUSE - including floors
5. EVIDENCE OF BROKEN WINDOWS
6. EVIDENCE OF POOR OR ROTTING FOUNDATION
7. EVIDENCE OF INADEQUATE ROOFING
8. EVIDENCE OF INADEQUATE HEATING AND/OR VENTILATION

V. PROCEDURE FOR COMPLETING THE HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SCALES

A. ITEMS BASED ON QUESTIONING THE RESPONDENT

NOTE: All questions that should be asked of the respondent are contained in Section III. Answers to these questions should be recorded at the time of the interview as noted therein for each specific question.

B. ITEMS BASED ON OBSERVATION

NOTE: Mentally note the answers to items requiring observation only (i.e., all items not specifically contained in Section III) at the time of the visit. As soon as you leave the respondent's home, you should mark the answers to the following items in the original Household Rating Scales:

I. HOUSING SCALES

Numbers 1, 2B, 2E, 6C.

III. PERSONAL CLEANLINESS AND HYGIENE SCALES

Numbers 1-4; 6-12.

IV. SAFETY AND SANITATION SCALES

Numbers 1, 3, 7-8 or 7a-8a; 13-17.

The Homemaker or Case Aide may be consulted if necessary concerning answers to items 16 and 17 in the Sanitation and Safety Scales.

NOTE: Be sure that you have answered all of the items (enumerated above) based on observation only before you go on to the next respondent's home. This is extremely important since it relates directly to both the validity and reliability of our Household Rating Scales. If the next home is nearby and you would not have sufficient time to answer all of these items if the Homemaker or Case Aide took you directly there, have her drive you around until all items have been answered.

APPENDIX E.
Household Conditions Rating Survey: Demographic Data

APPENDIX E-1: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* LIVING IN INADEQUATELY HEATED HOMES**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	22	91.7%	23	20	87.0%
Case Aide Family	11	10	90.9	12	11	91.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	8	100.0	8	8	100.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	49	89.1%	55	48	87.3%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**For purposes of the survey, an "inadequately heated home" was defined as a residence in which no method was readily available for heating one or more of the inhabited rooms.

APPENDIX E-2: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WITH ONE OR MORE APPARENT HEATING HAZARDS IN THE HOME **

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	16	66.7%	23	13	56.5%
Case Aide Family	11	8	72.7	12	8	66.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	8	100.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	55	41	74.5%	55	30	54.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**A heating hazard was considered to exist in the home if one or more of the following conditions was apparent at the time of the survey: (a) an unprotected fireplace; (b) a leaking gas heater; (c) an unvented gas heater; (d) a makeshift chimney; and (e) an unprotected ("open flame") heater.

APPENDIX E-3: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING ONE OR MORE LEAKS IN ROOF OF DWELLING

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	6	25.0%	23	9	39.1%
Case Aide Family	11	4	36.4	12	5	41.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	3	37.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	3	25.0	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	55	17	30.9%	55	19	34.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-4: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING LESS THAN ONE OPERABLE WINDOW PER INHABITED ROOM OF RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	3	12.5%	23	3	13.0%
Case Aide Family	11	1	9.1	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	1	12.5	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	2	16.7	12	3	25.0
Total Sample	55	7	12.7%	55	6	10.9%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-5: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING TWO OR MORE BROKEN WINDOW PANES IN RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	1	4.2%	23	2	8.7%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	4	33.3	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	55	5	9.1%	55	7	12.7%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-6: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* RESIDING IN DWELLINGS CONTAINING NO PIPED WATER

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	18	75.0%	23	17	73.9%
Case Aide Family	11	5	45.5	12	5	41.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	8	66.7	12	8	66.7
Total Sample	55	35	63.6%	55	34	61.8%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-7: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* RESIDING IN DWELLINGS CONTAINING COLD PIPED WATER ONLY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	3	12.5%	23	4	17.4%
Case Aide Family	11	1	9.1	12	2	16.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	3	37.5	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	1	8.3	12	1	8.3
Total Sample	55	8	14.5%	55	9	16.4%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-8: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING NO OPERABLE FLUSH TOILET IN RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	20	83.3%	23	20	87.0%
Case Aide Family	11	8	72.7	12	8	66.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	5	62.5	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	42	76.4%	55	41	74.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-9: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING NO KITCHEN SINK IN RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	18	75.0%	23	19	82.6%
Case Aide Family	11	5	45.5	12	6	50.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	8	66.7	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	35	63.6%	55	38	69.1%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-10: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING NO LAVORATORY IN RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	21	87.5%	23	21	91.3%
Case Aide Family	11	8	72.7	12	8	66.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	6	75.0	8	5	62.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	44	80.0%	55	43	78.2%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-11: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING NO BATHTUB OR SHOWER IN RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	21	87.5%	23	21	91.3%
Case Aide Family	11	7	63.6	12	7	58.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	6	75.0	8	5	62.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	43	78.2%	55	42	76.4%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-12: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* POSSESSING NO KITCHEN RANGE IN WORKING CONDITION**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	0	0.0%	23	0	0.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	2	25.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	1	8.3	12	0	0.0
Total Sample	55	3	5.5%	55	1	1.8%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**A kitchen range was defined as a unit consisting of an oven plus at least three burners.

APPENDIX E-13: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* USING KEROSENE, WOOD, OR COAL AS FUEL FOR COOKING

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	9	37.5%	23	8	34.8%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	2	16.7	12	1	8.3
Total Sample	55	15	27.3%	55	11	20.0%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-14: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* LACKING SCREENS FOR WINDOWS OF THE RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	16	66.7%	23	17	73.9%
Case Aide Family	11	7	63.6	12	9	75.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	6	75.0	8	7	87.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	7	58.3	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	55	36	65.5%	55	40	72.7%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-15: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* LACKING SCREENS FOR ENTRANCES TO THE RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	10	41.7%	23	14	60.9%
Case Aide Family	11	2	18.2	12	5	41.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	3	37.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	8	66.7	12	6	50.0
Total Sample	55	24	43.6%	55	28	50.9%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-16: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* RESIDING IN DWELLINGS WITH UNPROTECTED FOUNDATIONS**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	21	87.5%	23	20	87.0%
Case Aide Family	11	7	63.6	12	8	66.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	6	75.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	8	66.7	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	55	40	72.7%	55	41	74.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**For purposes of this survey, an unprotected foundation was defined as an open crawl or air space beneath the first floor of the dwelling or as a basement having unprotected windows and/or doors.

APPENDIX E-17: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* COMPLAINING OF RODENT INFESTATION INSIDE THE HOME

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	13	54.2%	23	11	47.8%
Case Aide Family	11	5	45.5	12	5	41.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	7	58.3	12	6	50.0
Total Sample	55	29	52.7%	55	26	47.3%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-18: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS' CHILDREN WHO WERE WEARING VISIBLY TATTERED OR TORN CLOTHING AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY*		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	17	3	17.6%	23	6	26.1%
Case Aide Family	8	0	0.0	9	2	22.2
Social Work "Contact" Family	6	3	50.0	6	2	33.3
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	6	75.0	12	4	33.3
Total Sample	39	12	30.8%	50	14	28.0%

*Information is presented in this table for June on the children of all 3 of the respondents whose casework classification was changed during the interval between the two surveys.

†In several instances no children were present in the home at the time of the survey and the N's presented above are reduced accordingly.

APPENDIX E-19: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS' CHILDREN WHOSE HANDS AND FACES WERE COVERED BY AN ACCUMULATION OF FILTH*

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY**		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	17	4	23.5%	23	9	39.1%
Case Aide Family	8	1	12.5	9	3	33.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	6	6	100.0	6	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	5	62.5	12	8	66.7
Total Sample	39	16	41.0%	50	20	40.0%

*The guidelines for judging cleanliness are presented in Appendix C of this report.

**Information is presented in this table for June on the children of all 3 of the respondents whose casework classification was changed during the interval between the two surveys.

†In several instances no children were present in the home at the time of the survey and the N's presented above are reduced accordingly.

APPENDIX E-20: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS' CHILDREN HAVING AN ACCUMULATION OF FILTH ON EARS, NECK OR HAIR*

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY**		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	17	2	11.8%	23	10	43.5%
Case Aide Family	8	0	0.0	9	2	22.2
Social Work "Contact" Family	6	6	100.0	6	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	5	62.5	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	39	13	33.3%	50	19	38.0%

*The guidelines for judging cleanliness are presented in Appendix C of this report.

**Information is presented in this table for June on the children of all 3 of the respondents whose casework classification was changed during the interval between the two surveys.

†In several instances no children were present in the home at the time of the survey and the N's presented above are reduced accordingly.

APPENDIX E-21: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHO BATHE THEIR CHILDREN INFREQUENTLY**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	1	4.2%	23	0	0.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	3	25.0	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	55	4	7.3%	55	3	5.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to Social Work 'Contact'".

**The frequencies and percentages presented in this table are based on those respondents who claimed to bathe their children less often than once per week.

APPENDIX E-22: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS' CHILDREN WHO WERE WEARING INAPPROPRIATE APPAREL* AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY**		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	17	3	17.6%	23	5	21.7%
Case Aide Family	8	2	25.0	9	2	22.2
Social Work "Contact" Family	6	0	0.0	6	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	5	62.5	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	39	10	25.6%	50	9	18.0%

*The guidelines for judging appropriateness of apparel are presented in Appendix C of this report.

**Information is presented in this table for June on the children of all 3 of the respondents whose casework classification was changed during the interval between the two surveys.

†In several instances no children were present in the home at the time of the survey and the N's presented above are reduced accordingly.

APPENDIX E-23: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS CLAIMING TO POSSESS INADEQUATE WEARING APPAREL FOR CHILDREN

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY*		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	17	1	5.9%	23	1	4.3%
Case Aide Family	8	2	25.0	9	1	11.1
Social Work "Contact" Family	6	0	0.0	6	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	4	50.0	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	39	7	17.9%	50	4	8.0%

*Information is presented in this table for June on all 3 respondents whose casework classification was changed during the interval between the two surveys.

†This information was not available for 16 and 5 respectively of the 55 respondents who participated in the February and June surveys. Hence the N's are reduced accordingly.

APPENDIX E-24: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS' CHILDREN WHO WERE WEARING UNLAUNDERED CLOTHING* AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY**		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	17	9	52.9%	23	14	60.9%
Case Aide Family	8	1	12.5	9	4	44.4
Social Work "Contact" Family	6	6	100.0	6	2	33.3
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	5	62.5	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	39	21	53.8%	50	27	54.0%

*"Unlaundered Clothing" refers in this instance to apparel which is caked with dirt, food, fecal matter, coal dust or other filth rather than to clothing which is merely stained or dirty in spots. (See guidelines in Appendix C of this report).

**Information is presented in this table for June on the children of all 3 of the respondents whose casework classification was changed during the interval between the two surveys.

†In several instances no children were present in the home at the time of the survey and the N's presented above are reduced accordingly.

APPENDIX E-25: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WEARING VISIBLY TATTERED OR TORN CLOTHING

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	10	41.7%	23	5	21.7%
Case Aide Family	11	3	27.3	12	2	16.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	6	50.0	12	4	33.3
Total Sample	55	23	41.8%	55	13	23.6%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-26: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHOSE HANDS AND FACES WERE COVERED BY AN ACCUMULATION OF FILTH**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	2	8.3%	23	3	13.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	3	37.5	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	5	41.7	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	55	10	18.2%	55	5	9.1%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**The guidelines for judging cleanliness are presented in Appendix C of this report.

APPENDIX E-27: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING AN ACCUMULATION OF FILTH ON EARS, NECK OR HAIR**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	2	8.3%	23	3	13.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	3	37.5	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	5	41.7	12	4	33.3
Total Sample	55	10	18.2%	55	7	12.7%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**The guidelines for judging cleanliness are presented in Appendix C of this report.

APPENDIX E-28: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WEARING UNLAUNDERED CLOTHING** AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	10	41.7%	23	9	39.1%
Case Aide Family	11	5	45.5	12	2	16.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	6	75.0	8	1	12.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	5	41.7	12	4	33.3
Total Sample	55	26	47.3%	55	16	29.1%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**"Unlaundered Clothing" refers in this instance to apparel which is caked with dirt, food, fecal matter, coal dust, or other filth rather than to clothing which is merely stained or dirty in spots. (See guidelines in Appendix C of this report.)

APPENDIX E-29: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* POSSESSING AN INADEQUATE NUMBER OF EATING UTENSILS**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	2	8.3%	23	2	8.7%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	1	8.3	12	1	8.3
Total Sample	55	3	5.5%	55	3	5.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**A family was judged as having an inadequate number of eating utensils if the ratio of family size to any of the following utensils was less than 1 to 1: drinking container (glass or cup); dish (bowl or plate); and flatware (fork or spoon).

APPENDIX E-30: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WITH CONDITIONS DEEMED HAZARDOUS TO CHILDREN IN THE YARD SURROUNDING THE HOME**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	16	66.7%	23	19	82.6%
Case Aide Family	11	6	54.5	12	6	50.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	7	87.5	8	5	62.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	10	83.3	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	39	70.9%	55	39	70.9%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Conditions deemed hazardous to children included metal scrap; broken glass; discarded appliances, such as a refrigerator, in which the child could become trapped; slag heaps; and holes, ditches or open wells.

APPENDIX E-31: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WITH NO ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	1	4.2%	23	0	0.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Total Sample	55	1	1.8%	55	1	1.8%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-32: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING HOLES OR LOOSE BOARDS IN FLOORING OF RESIDENCE

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	11	45.8%	23	11	47.8%
Case Aide Family	11	5	45.5	12	3	25.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	3	37.5	8	1	12.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	7	58.3	12	4	33.3
Total Sample	55	26	47.3%	55	19	34.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-33: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* DISPOSING OF GARBAGE LESS OFTEN THAN ONCE PER DAY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	7	29.2%	23	5	21.7%
Case Aide Family	11	3	27.3	12	2	16.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	3	25.0	12	1	8.3
Total Sample	55	17	30.9%	55	12	21.8%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-34: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* USING INADEQUATE METHOD FOR GARBAGE DISPOSAL**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	23***	18	78.3%	23	20	87.0%
Case Aide Family	11	10	90.9	12	12	100.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	5	62.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	54***	41	75.9%	55	46	83.6%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Only two methods of garbage disposal were considered to be adequate. These consisted of (1) disposal by burial in a sanitary land fill located at least 50 feet from the residential water supply, and (2) disposal by burning followed by burial of any residue.

***Adequacy of garbage disposal was not rated in February 1968 for one of the 24 "Homemaking" families because the necessary information was not available.

APPENDIX E-35: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING NO TOILET FACILITIES WHATSOEVER**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	0	0.0%	23	0	0.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	1	12.5	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	1	8.3	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	55	2	3.6%	55	2	3.6%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**"No Toilet Facilities Whatsoever" refers to the absence of both a flush toilet and pit privy.

APPENDIX E-36: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHOSE TOILET FACILITIES EMPTY INTO AN INADEQUATE OUTLET**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	11	45.8%	23	9	39.1%
Case Aide Family	11	1	9.1	12	3	25.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	7	4	57.1	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	11	3	27.3	10	5	50.0
Total Sample	53	19	35.8%	53	17	32.1%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Any outlet other than a public sewer or septic tank was considered inadequate for flush toilets. For pit privies, the outlet was rated as inadequate if the pit was located within 50 feet of any source of water supply or if the pit was located at a higher elevation than the water supply.

†The two families having no toilet facilities whatsoever are not included in the N's presented above.

APPENDIX E-37: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* MAINTAINING AN UNCLEAN FLUSH TOILET**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	4	3	75.0%	3	2	66.7%
Case Aide Family	3	2	66.7	4	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	3	1	33.3	4	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	3	2	66.7	3	0	0.0
Total Sample	13	8	61.5%	14	2	14.3%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**The flush toilet was considered to be unclean if the water closet, including any fixture therein, was not in good repair and free from dirt, dust, insects, and other contamination at the time of the interview.

†Respondents not possessing a flush toilet are not included in these N's.

APPENDIX E-38: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING A PIT PRIVY AS THE ONLY TOILET FACILITY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	20	83.3%	23	20	87.0%
Case Aide Family	11	8	72.7	12	8	66.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	8	66.7	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	55	40	72.7%	55	39	70.9%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-39: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* MAINTAINING AN UNSANITARY AND/OR INADEQUATELY CONSTRUCTED PIT PRIVY**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	†N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	20	20	100.0%	20	20	100.0%
Case Aide Family	8	8	100.0	8	8	100.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	4	4	100.0	4	4	100.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	8	8	100.0	7	7	100.0
Total Sample	40	40	100.0%	39	39	100.0%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**The guidelines presented in Appendix C of this report were used in judging the cleanliness and construction of each pit privy.

†The N's presented above include only those respondents who, at the time of the survey, relied exclusively on a pit privy for toilet facilities.

APPENDIX E-40: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* USING AN INADEQUATE SOURCE FOR DRINKING WATER**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	17	70.8%	23	17	73.9%
Case Aide Family	11	10	90.9	12	11	91.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	3	37.5	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	10	83.3	12	11	91.7
Total Sample	55	40	72.7%	55	43	78.2%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Drinking water was not considered to be adequate unless it was obtained from a cistern, a spring, a public system, or a private company. In addition, any water supply which was located within 50 feet of any sanitary land fill, pit privy or sewage outlet was deemed inadequate.

APPENDIX E-41: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING AN INADEQUATE SUPPLY OF WATER FOR BATHING**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	6	25.0%	23	8	34.8%
Case Aide Family	11	1	9.1	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	1	12.5	8	1	12.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	4	33.3	12	3	25.0
Total Sample	55	12	21.8%	55	13	23.6%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Water for bathing was judged to be inadequate if the respondent did not have a cistern, well or spring located within 50 feet of his residence and, in addition, his residence was not supplied with piped water.

APPENDIX E-42: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* HAVING NO FACILITIES FOR STORING PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	1	4.2%	23	0	0.0%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	2	16.7	12	1	8.3
Total Sample	55	3	5.5%	55	2	3.6%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**By "Facilities For Storing Perishable Foodstuffs" is meant a refrigerator, ice box, home freezer, or a springhouse.

APPENDIX E-43: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* USING AN INADEQUATE METHOD FOR STORAGE OF NONPERISHABLE FOODS**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	12	50.0%	23	11	47.8%
Case Aide Family	11	9	81.8	12	7	58.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	6	75.0	8	6	75.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	7	58.3	12	6	50.0
Total Sample	55	34	61.8%	55	30	54.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Respondents who failed to store dry foods in closed containers, such as airtight boxes, jars or canisters, were rated as using an inadequate method for storing nonperishable foodstuffs.

APPENDIX E-44: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHOSE HOMES WERE LITTERED WITH GARBAGE OR OTHER DEBRIS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	14	58.3%	23	6	26.1%
Case Aide Family	11	4	36.4	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	2	25.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	6	50.0	12	5	41.7
Total Sample	55	26	47.3%	55	12	21.8%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**In obtaining information relevant to this table, the interviewer took into account the overall condition of both the dwelling and its furnishings.

APPENDIX E-45: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHO HAD DIRTY DISHES PILED IN THE KITCHEN AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	4	16.7%	23	14	60.9%
Case Aide Family	11	4	36.4	12	2	16.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	2	25.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	7	58.3
Total Sample	55	19	34.5%	55	25	45.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Respondents having less than five dirty dishes in their kitchens at the time of the survey are not included in the frequencies and percentages presented above. Also not included are respondents who were interviewed at mealtime.

APPENDIX E-46: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHOSE FLOORS APPEARED TO HAVE BEEN UNSWEPT FOR SOME PERIOD OF TIME**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	6	25.0%	23	7	30.4%
Case Aide Family	11	2	18.2	12	2	16.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	2	25.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	4	33.3	12	3	25.0
Total Sample	55	14	25.5%	55	14	25.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**In obtaining the information on which these frequencies and percentages are based, the interviewer was instructed to judge only the condition of the flooring and hence to disregard the overall condition of the dwelling and its contents.

APPENDIX E-47: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHO HAD ONE OR MORE FARM ANIMALS** INSIDE THE HOME AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	1	4.2%	23	1	4.3%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	1	8.3	12	2	16.7
Total Sample	55	2	3.6%	55	3	5.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**e.g., pigs, chickens, goats, etc. and excluding domestic cats and dogs.

APPENDIX E-48: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* MAINTAINING A DOG OR CAT INDOORS UNDER UNSANITARY CONDITIONS**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	0	0.0%	23	0	0.0%
Case Aide Family	11	2	18.2	12	0	0.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	0	0.0	8	0	0.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	1	8.3	12	0	0.0
Total Sample	55	3	5.5%	55	0	0.0%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**The frequencies and percentages in this table were based on the following observation made by the interviewer at the time of the survey: "If a dog or a cat is kept inside, is their waste properly disposed of?"

APPENDIX E-49: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHO PLANNED TO RAISE A GARDEN**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	23	95.8%	23	21	91.3%
Case Aide Family	11	10	90.9	12	11	91.7
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	5	62.5	8	6	75.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	8	66.7	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	46	83.6%	55	47	85.5%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**At the time of the February 1968 survey, the respondent was asked if he planned to raise a garden during the growing season. During the June 1968 survey he was asked whether he currently was raising a garden.

APPENDIX E-50: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	17	70.8%	23	16	69.6%
Case Aide Family	11	5	45.5	12	4	33.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	4	50.0	8	3	37.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	10	83.3	12	11	91.7
Total Sample	55	36	65.5%	55	34	61.8%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX E-51: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* RESIDING IN A RENTED DWELLING**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	15	62.5%	23	15	65.2%
Case Aide Family	11	4	36.4	12	3	25.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	6	75.0	8	5	62.5
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	9	75.0	12	9	75.0
Total Sample	55	34	61.8%	55	32	58.2%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Of the 55 respondents, three in February 1968 and six in June 1968 neither owned nor rented the dwelling in which they were residing.

APPENDIX E-52: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* WHO OWNED THE HOME IN WHICH THEY WERE RESIDING**

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	7	29.2%	23	6	26.1%
Case Aide Family	11	6	54.5	12	6	50.0
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	2	25.0	8	2	25.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	3	25.0	12	3	25.0
Total Sample	55	18	32.7%	55	17	30.9%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

**Of the 55 respondents, three in February 1968 and six in June 1968 neither owned nor rented the dwelling in which they were residing.

APPENDIX E-53: FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD CONDITIONS RATING SURVEY RESPONDENTS* RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE OR WELFARE ALLOTMENT

RESPONDENT'S CLASSIFICATION	FEBRUARY 1968 SURVEY			JUNE 1968 SURVEY		
	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	N	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Homemaking Family	24	8	33.3%	23	5	21.7%
Case Aide Family	11	0	0.0	12	1	8.3
Social Work "Contact" Family	8	5	62.5	8	4	50.0
Homemaking "Multiproblem" Family	12	5	41.7	12	6	50.0
Total Sample	55	18	32.7%	55	16	29.1%

*The data presented in this table are for the 55 families whose housing conditions were rated in February 1968 and again in June 1968. In the interim the casework classification was changed as follows for three of these families: "Homemaking" to "Case Aide"; "Social Work 'Contact'" to "Homemaking"; and "Homemaking" to "Social Work 'Contact'".

APPENDIX F.

Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale

INSTRUCTION FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UTILIZING FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR SCALE"

ORDER I:* INSTRUCTIONS: How do you do? I'm ______________________ from the Day Care Program Research Office. We're doing a survey in this part of the country to find out how parents of young children feel about different methods of raising children. You know, people differ in their opinions about how children should be brought up. We're interested in learning how parents feel about this and a number of other issues.

I'm going to read you some statements that express different opinions about child-rearing techniques or methods, and then I want you to tell me how you feel about these statements. I'll read each statement twice, and then I'd like for you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with the opinion expressed in the statement I've just read.

Okay, do you understand?

Do you have any questions?

---

*These instructions were used to introduce the "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale" when the latter preceded the "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale" in order of administration.

INSTRUCTION FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UTILIZING FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR SCALE" (CONT'D.)

ORDER II:** INSTRUCTIONS: The second topic I'd like to talk to you about this morning (afternoon) concerns the issue of ways of bringing up children. You know, people have all kinds of opinions about how children should be brought up and we're also interested in how parents feel about this issue.

I'm going to read you some more statements, but this time the statements will express different opinions about child-rearing techniques or methods. I'll read each statement to you twice just like I did last time and then I'd like for you to tell me whether or not you agree with the opinion expressed in the statement. Okay?

**The "ORDER II" INSTRUCTIONS were used to introduce the "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale" when its presentation was second in order of administration.

ATTITUDE TOWARD UTILIZING FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR SCALE

Scale Values	Q Values		
10.16	1.3	1.	IF A CHILD IS AFRAID OF HIS PARENTS, HE WON'T RESPECT THEM.
3.31	2.7	2.	PARENTS SOMETIMES HAVE TO MAKE A CHILD AFRAID TO KEEP HIM FROM DOING SOMETHING THAT WILL HARM OTHERS OR HIMSELF.
9.35	1.5	3.	SCARING A CHILD IS BAD FOR HIM IN MOST WAYS.
2.16	1.7	4.	PARENTS SHOULD MAKE CHILDREN AFRAID OF BREAKING THE LAW.
8.35	2.9	5.	IT IS NOT USUALLY A VERY GOOD IDEA FOR PARENTS TO SCARE A CHILD INTO MINDING.
5.20	3.6	6.	CHILDREN SHOULD BE PUNISHED WHEN THEY'RE BAD AND PRAISED WHEN THEY'RE GOOD.
7.42	3.8	7.	PARENTS CAN SOMETIMES BE UNFAIR IN PUNISHING A CHILD.
1.12	0.6	8.	IN ORDER TO RAISE A CHILD RIGHT, YOU HAVE TO MAKE HIM AFRAID OF WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO HIM IF HE DOESN'T MIND YOU.
10.21	1.1	9.	IT IS NOT RIGHT TO MAKE A CHILD AFRAID JUST TO GET HIM TO MIND.
8.14	2.7	10.	EVEN THOUGH SOMETIMES PARENTS HAVE NO OTHER CHOICE BUT TO THREATEN A CHILD, THE CHILD MAY STILL BE HURT IN SOME WAY.
6.69	3.3	11.	WELL-MEANING PARENTS CAN MAKE A MISTAKE IN PUNISHING A CHILD.
4.21	2.0	12.	SOMETIMES YOU CAN GET A CHILD TO MIND BY THREATENING TO WHIP HIM.

ATTITUDE TOWARD UTILIZING FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR SCALE (CONT'D.)

Scale Values	Q Values		
4.14	2.2	13.	EVEN GOOD PARENTS HAVE TO SCARE THEIR CHILDREN INTO MINDING EVERY NOW AND THEN.
10.83	0.7	14.	MAKING A CHILD AFRAID IS ALWAYS BAD FOR HIM.
9.12	1.7	15.	SCARING A CHILD TO MAKE HIM DO WHAT YOU TELL HIM TO DO MIGHT MAKE A COWARD OF HIM.
2.71	2.1	16.	IF A CHILD HAS BEEN PUNISHED FOR DOING SOMETHING ONCE, HE WILL THINK TWICE BEFORE DOING IT AGAIN.
5.14	2.4	17.	YOU SHOULDN'T SCARE A CHILD INTO DOING WHAT YOU TELL HIM TO DO UNLESS YOU HAVE TO.
1.28	1.1	18.	IT JUST ISN'T POSSIBLE TO RAISE CHILDREN RIGHT WITHOUT USING FEAR TO CONTROL THE WAY THEY ACT.
5.53	3.9	19.	PARENTS HAVE TO USE THEIR OWN JUDGMENT ABOUT WHEN TO PUNISH A CHILD AND WHEN NOT TO.
1.61	1.4	20.	CHILDREN ARE EASY TO SCARE SO SCARING THEM IS A GOOD WAY TO GET THEM TO MIND.
5.76	3.0	21.	IT SHOULD BE UP TO THE PARENTS TO MAKE THEIR CHILD MIND.
10.94	0.6	22.	SCARING A CHILD IS THE MEANEST THING YOU CAN DO TO HIM.

APPENDIX G.
Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES SCALE"

ORDER I:* INSTRUCTIONS: How do you do? I'm ________________________ from the Day Care Program Research Office. We're doing a survey in this part of the country to find out how parents of young children feel about the issue of children's rights and liberties. You know, people differ in their opinions about how much freedom children should be allowed to have to do what they want to do. We're interested in learning how parents feel about this and a number of other issues.

I'm going to read you some statements that express different opinions about the question of children's rights and liberties, and then I want you to tell me how you feel about these statements. I'll read each statement twice, and then I'd like for you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with the opinion expressed in the statement I've just read.

Okay, do you understand?

Do you have any questions?

---

*These instructions were used to introduce the "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale" when the latter preceded the "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale" in order of administration.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES SCALE" (CONT'D.)

ORDER II:** INSTRUCTIONS: The second topic I'd like to talk to you about this morning (afternoon) concerns the issue of children's rights and liberties. You know, people have all kinds of opinions about how much freedom children should be allowed to have and we're also interested in how parents feel about this issue.

I'm going to read you some more statements, but this time the statements will express different opinions about children's rights and liberties. I'll read each statement to you twice just like I did last time and then I'd like for you to tell me whether or not you agree with the opinion expressed in the statement. Okay?

**The "ORDER II" INSTRUCTIONS were used to introduce the "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale" when its presentation was second in order of administration.

ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES SCALE

Scale Values	Q Values		
3.94	3.9	1.	IT'S ALL RIGHT TO LET A CHILD HAVE HIS WAY EXCEPT WHEN HE MIGHT GET HURT OR HURT SOMEONE ELSE.
1.18	0.8	2.	A CHILD SHOULD HAVE PRIVACY WHEN HE WANTS TO BE ALONE.
7.92	4.4	3.	IT'S BETTER TO BE TOO STRICT WITH CHILDREN THEN NOT STRICT ENOUGH.
1.92	2.2	4.	CHILDREN SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO DO WHAT THEY WANT TO DO DURING THEIR PLAY TIME SO LONG AS IT'S NOT DANGEROUS.
1.27	1.1	5.	A CHILD SHOULD NEVER BE PUNISHED FOR MAKING HIS LIKES AND DISLIKES KNOWN.
10.25	1.7	6.	PEOPLE WHO KNOW HOW TO HANDLE CHILDREN DON'T PUT UP WITH ANY NONSENSE.
2.22	1.9	7.	A CHILD SHOULD BE GIVEN MORE THAN ONE CHANCE TO OBEY HIS PARENTS.
10.93	0.6	8.	CHILDREN SHOULD BE SEEN AND NOT HEARD.
9.93	2.0	9.	ADULTS SHOULDN'T HAVE TO EXPLAIN TO A CHILD WHY THE CHILD MUST MIND THEM.
8.08	4.1	10.	A CHILD SHOULD LEARN TO CONSIDER OTHER PEOPLE'S WISHES BEFORE HIS OWN.
2.81	3.4	11.	IT IS NOT GOOD FOR PARENTS TO BE TOO STRICT WITH THEIR CHILDREN.
5.00	4.2	12.	SOMETIMES IT'S ALL RIGHT TO LET CHILDREN RUN WILD.

ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES SCALE (CONT'D.)

Scale Values	Q Values		
7.06	3.8	13.	YOUNG CHILDREN SHOULD BE FORCED TO MIND BUT OLDER CHILDREN SHOULD BE REASONED WITH AND TALKED TO.
9.45	3.4	14.	IT ISN'T GOOD FOR A CHILD TO EVER BE ALONE.
10.92	0.6	15.	PARENTS SHOULD TELL THEIR CHILDREN WHAT TO PLAY AS WELL AS WHEN TO PLAY.
6.00	2.5	16.	A CHILD IS NATURALLY SELFISH UNTIL HE IS TAUGHT BY HIS PARENTS TO SHARE.
6.29	4.4	17.	AT TIMES PARENTS SHOULD DECIDE HOW THEIR CHILD IS GOING TO SPEND HIS FREE TIME.
5.67	3.1	18.	THERE ARE SOME ADULTS WHO DO NOT DESERVE A CHILD'S RESPECT.
9.33	3.1	19.	IF A CHILD DOESN'T SAY "PLEASE" WHEN HE ASKS FOR SOMETHING, YOU SHOULDN'T GIVE IT TO HIM.
2.55	3.2	20.	IT'S BETTER TO GIVE A CHILD TOO MUCH FREEDOM THEN NOT ENOUGH.
4.00	3.1	21.	THERE MAY BE TIMES WHEN A CHILD SHOULD NOT DO WHAT HIS ELDERS TELL HIM TO DO.
8.29	4.1	22.	CHILDREN SHOULD BE KEPT FROM GETTING IN THINGS THAT ARE NONE OF THEIR BUSINESS.

APPENDIX H.

Original Item Pool Used in Construction of The "Attitude Toward Utilizing Fear to Control Children's Behavior Scale"

ORIGINAL ITEM POOL USED IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD UTILIZING FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR SCALE"

1. The most harmful thing in the world that parents can do is to frighten a child.

2. If a child is rewarded for being good, he won't need to be punished for being bad.

3. Whipping a child may make him act better.

4. If you can't make a child mind you by any other means, then you should scare him into minding you.

5. All children need to be scared often to make them behave.

6. A child who is afraid of his parents will respect them more than a child who is not afraid.

7. A good easy way to make children mind is to scare them.

8. Parents who know how to handle children usually don't have to scare them into minding.

9. Sometimes parents can hurt a child by scaring him.

10. Children should be allowed to explain why they disobeyed their parents.

11. Teaching a child fear is never good for him.

12. If a child is made afraid for trying to be helpful, he will be less likely to ever want to be helpful again.

13. At times parents have no other choice than to punish a child.

14. It is a terrible thing for parents to bring up a child to be afraid.

15. Parents really do hurt their children badly by scaring them.

16. A good way to get a child to mind is to threaten to go away and leave him all alone.

17. How often a child is scared by his parents should depend on the way he acts.

18. Parents shouldn't interfere with what a child does as long as he isn't tearing up anything.

19. Scaring a child will hurt him in every possible way as he grows older.

20. There are better ways of punishing a child than spanking him.

21. There are better ways to get a child to mind than by scaring him.

22. If fear is used to make a child mind, this hurts his ability to think clearly.

23. It doesn't do any good to punish a very young child because he doesn't realize what he has done.

24. Teaching a child fear hurts him more than it helps.

25. Fear is the easiest way of controlling a child.

26. There are times when children should be punished.

27. Scaring a child is bad for him in most ways.

28. If a child is punished a lot, he will start hating his parents.

29. The use of fear is more important with a young child than an older one.

30. If a child is bad during the day, he should be punished then.

31. No good comes from scaring a child.

32. A child should be whipped every once in a while for the things he has done that his parents don't know about.

33. A child should know that laws are made to protect him and that he must not break them.

34. Mothers who threaten to stop loving their children if they don't obey are not good mothers.

35. Children must be punished every now and then for their own good.

36. Children should be allowed to grow up without fear of being punished.

37. Fear can bring about results with children sometimes.

38. It is not right to make a child afraid just to get him to mind.

39. Only parents who are no good use fear to get their children to mind.

40. As best they can, parents should bring a child up to mind.

41. A child should be allowed to express himself freely.

42. Good parents never scare their children into minding them.

43. A bad child should be threatened with no food.

44. Scaring a child is the only way to make him behave.

45. Scaring a child makes him cowardly.

46. Good parents don't bring their children up to be scared of things.

47. Children should be whipped a lot so that they won't be spoiled.

48. Children should be punished when they're bad; praised when they're good.

49. Children who cry and whine a lot should be whipped.

50. Even good parents have to scare their children into minding every now and then.

51. Children should always be afraid of their parents so they will mind them.

52. Children can't understand why they have to follow certain rules so they must be scared and threatened into obeying.

53. If a child is frequently afraid, he will always be nervous.

54. If a child is visiting a friend and acts bad, the friend's parents should whip him.

55. Children should be whipped regularly to keep them in line.

56. A child should know that he will be punished for doing certain things.

57. Using fear to make a child mind helps more than it hurts.

58. It isn't right to tell a child he will get sick if he doesn't do what you say.

59. Making a child afraid should be entirely dependent upon his behavior.

60. The worst way to make a child well-behaved is to punish him.

61. If a child says he's too sick to go to school, what he really needs is a good whipping.

62. A child who isn't afraid of his father won't mind him.

63. Parents should never threaten to harm something the child loves in order to make him mind.

64. A good child should never be scared but a bad one should be scared often.

5

65. Scaring a child has no effect at all on him.

66. Scaring a child will not teach him anything.

67. A child responds better to being scared into minding than he does to a lot of talk.

68. Fear is a good, easy way to make children do what you tell them to do.

69. A child will mind if he knows that his play things will be taken away from him if he doesn't.

70. Children should be brought up to be afraid of wrong-doing.

71. Scaring a child by telling him you're going to whip him doesn't hurt him any.

72. A child should know that he had better never get caught lying to his parents.

73. Scaring a child makes him do what you tell him to do in a hurry.

74. Parents have to use their own judgment about when to punish a child and when not to.

75. You can't make a child mind if he isn't afraid of you.

76. Only a cruel parent would scare his children.

77. Scaring a child into minding usually does more harm than good.

78. If a child is really sorry for something bad that he has done, he should not be punished.

79. Bad parents scare their children into minding.

80. Making a child afraid of what the people in the community will think about him is better than making him afraid of being whipped.

81. Scaring a child to make him do what you tell him to do might make a coward of him.

82. Children should be scared to keep them from hurting themselves.

83. It just isn't possible to raise children right without using fear to control the way they act.

84. You can't get a child to do what you say just by threatening him.

85. Parents who care for their children don't usually have to scare them into minding.

86. A parent should go ahead and whip a child if he has told him he's going to get a whipping.

87. Before he's whipped, a child should be told that he's going to get whipped.

88. To get a child to pay attention to what his parents say, he must be yelled at or whipped.

89. Children should be spanked until they are about ten or twelve years old.

90. If a child doesn't want to do his chores, he should be whipped and made to do them.

91. Making a child afraid is always bad for him.

92. Scaring a child to make him mind you is all right because children are so easy to scare.

93. Parents who want to bring their children up right should never scare them into minding.

94. Scaring children makes them do what you tell them to.

95. Shaming a child for doing something bad is better than whipping him.

96. A child minds better when he's afraid of what will happen to him if he doesn't mind.

97. Children are too young to understand the meaning of right and wrong so they should never be punished.

98. A child should know what his parents will and will not let him do so he will not be afraid of being whipped for something he didn't know was wrong.

99. Children should not be taught to be afraid of the law.

100. The best way to get a child to mind is to put the fear of the Lord in him.

101. If a child is afraid of his parents, he won't respect them.

102. Parents should make children afraid of breaking the law.

103. There's nothing wrong with using fear to control children so long as it's used wisely.

104. Parents should never tell a child that they are going to go off and leave him.

105. Children should be afraid to act bad in front of strangers.

106. Even though sometimes parents have no other choice but to threaten a child, the child may still be hurt in some way.

107. How often a child is scared should depend on how bad he acts.

108. When a child has done something really bad, he should be scared to ever do it again.

109. A child should be afraid of all grown-ups, not just his parents.

110. If a child has done something bad, scaring him won't keep him from doing it again.

111. Scaring a child to make him do what you tell him to will make him a sissy.

112. Well-meaning parents can make a mistake in punishing a child.

113. Children are easy to scare so scaring them is a good way to get them to mind.

114. Scaring a child is the meanest thing you can do to him.

115. The best way to raise a child is to use fear to control his behavior.

116. Fear shouldn't be used to make a child mind until everything else has been tried.

117. Children ought to be raised in the fear of the Lord.

118. When a child is bad, he should be locked in a shed for a few hours as a lesson.

119. Getting a child to mind by talking with him is better than scaring him into obeying.

120. It should be up to the parents to make their child mind.

121. If a parent loves his child he will want the child to be good and he will whip the child when he acts bad.

122. A good way to make a child mind is to tell him you're going to send him to bed without any supper.

123. The best way to discipline a child is to punish him.

124. Scaring children makes them behave worse.

125. Scaring children is the best way to make them mind you.

126. All children need to be scared every now and then to make them behave.

127. Sometimes you can get a child to mind by threatening to whip him.

128. Children who are afraid of their parents don't mind as well as children who are not afraid of their parents.

129. If a parent wants his child to love and respect him, he will be fair in the way he punishes the child.

130. The only time you should ever make a child afraid is when he has done something really bad.

131. If a child is not whipped when he acts bad, he will grow up to be mean and selfish.

132. A child should mind because he wants to rather than because he is scared not to.

133. It is not usually a very good idea for parents to scare a child into minding.

134. Praising a child makes him get the big head.

135. Only the most wicked parents would scare a child into minding.

136. A child should never be told that he won't be loved if he doesn't mind.

137. Parents should never threaten to beat a child.

138. Scaring a child is necessary in some cases.

139. Threatening a child is not a good way to make him mind.

140. There are some things children should be scared for--and some they shouldn't.

141. It is always wrong for parents to scare a child.

142. Threatening a child with a whipping every once in a while doesn't do him any harm.

143. Parents run the risk of spoiling their child by not punishing him when he ought to be punished.

144. A child should be afraid to do anything a grown-up tells him not to do.

145. Some children can take being scared into minding better than others.

146. If a child is brought up the way he ought to be, he will not need to be frightened in order to make him behave.

147. Parents should do everything they can think of to get a child to mind before they try threatening him.

148. The way to get a child to stop sucking his thumb is to tell him you're going to cut his hand off if he doesn't quit.

149. It's better to whip a child than to argue with him.

150. One of the meanest things a parent can do is to punish a child.

151. It is bad for a child to be afraid of his parents.

152. Parents who love their children do not punish them.

153. Threatening a child with illness or death if he doesn't mind is a mean and cruel thing for a parent to do.

154. A child should be made to understand why he has to mind rather than be scared into minding.

155. There are some children who won't mind unless they're threatened with a whipping.

156. Parents might harm a child if they scare him when he is very young.

157. When a child is really bad, the mother should threaten to tell his father on him.

158. There is no reason why parents should not use fear to get their children to mind.

159. Children should be made to fear things that will hurt them.

160. Punishing a child just makes him mean.

161. Parents can sometimes be unfair in punishing a child.

162. Parents sometimes have to make a child afraid to keep him from doing something that will harm others or himself.

163. Parents who care about their children punish them at times.

164. Parents cannot punish a child without making the child afraid of them.

165. A child should not be whipped for doing something one day and not whipped for doing the same thing the next day.

166. A good way to get a child to mind is to tell him you're going to break his toys if he doesn't mind.

167. Children who are disrespectful to their parents should be punished.

168. Scaring a child is never necessary.

169. The only way to make a child mind you is to make him afraid of not minding.

170. Children look up to adults who make them mind.

171. The best way to make a child eat his supper is to promise him a whipping if he doesn't.

172. Even making a child afraid every now and then is bad for him.

173. A child should be afraid of his parents or he won't respect them.

174. Children who are afraid of their parents grow up to be well behaved.

175. Scaring a child has no effect on him except to make him afraid of his parents.

176. A child should be made to understand why he is being punished.

177. Accidents can happen sometimes when parents try to scare their children into minding.

178. Parents can't get a child to mind any quicker by threatening him.

179. Children should be taught to be afraid of the law.

180. Most parents do not have to use fear very often in bringing up their children.

181. Scaring a child every now and then to make him mind won't do him any harm.

182. It does not hurt to reward a child every now and then for being good.

183. There's a lot of truth in the old saying that if you spare the rod you'll spoil the child.

184. If a child has been punished for doing something once, he will think twice before doing it again.

185. When a child's brothers and sisters tease him about being whipped, they should be whipped too.

186. A child will mind his parents better if he is threatened with a beating.

187. Parents should make their children mind by means of love and understanding.

188. It isn't right to tell a child you won't love him if he doesn't mind you.

189. All children, at one time or another, need to be whipped.

190. Only the most hateful parents would scare a child into minding them.

191. It is very bad for parents to ever threaten a child.

192. Children should be taught to be afraid of some things.

193. It is wrong for parents to threaten their children.

194. In order to raise a child right, you have to make him afraid of what will happen to him if he doesn't mind you.

195. If a child is yelled at loudly enough, he will do what he is told.

196. If a child misbehaves in church, his parents should wait until they get home to punish him.

197. You shouldn't scare a child into doing what you tell him to do unless you have to.

198. How often a child is scared into minding is not important, but the way it is done is important.

199. It is easier to frighten a child into minding than it is to make him understand why he has to mind.

APPENDIX I.

Original Item Pool Used in Construction of The "Attitude Toward Children's Rights and Liberties Scale"

ORIGINAL ITEM POOL USED IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE "ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES SCALE"

1. A child should use good manners wherever he goes.

2. If a child says he is sick, he should not be made to go to school.

3. Parents should usually be strict with their children.

4. Parents should make a child eat whatever is put before him.

5. As a rule, children should not be allowed to talk back to their parents.

6. Children should never be forced to read books they don't want to read.

7. Adults should never interfere in children's play activities.

8. Parents should teach their children to take care of their own belongings.

9. A child should never be allowed to do as he pleases.

10. There are some adults who do not deserve a child's respect.

11. It's all right to let a child have his way except when he might get hurt or hurt someone else.

12. A child should not be taught to respect adults just because they are older than he.

13. People who know how to handle children don't put up with any nonsense.

14. Parents should never allow a child to choose his own clothing.

15. Parents should play with their children whenever they have the time.

16. If a child doesn't say "Please" when he asks for something, you shouldn't give it to him.

17. A child should be given more than one chance to obey his parents.

18. Children should be seen and not heard.

19. A child should never be punished for questioning old ways of doing things.

20. Young children should be forced to mind but older children should be reasoned with and talked to.

21. A child should know that he can't have everything he wants.

22. Parents should choose which books their child is going to read.

23. It isn't good for a child to ever be alone.

24. Children should be allowed to dress as they please.

25. If a child gets into trouble you should let him tell his side of the story before you punish him.

26. It is not good for parents to be too strict with their children.

27. Too many children run wild these days.

28. It's never a good idea to give a child everything he wants.

29. A child should have privacy when he wants to be alone.

30. A child who is selfish with his toys should have them taken away from him.

31. Children should wait to eat until after the grown-ups have finished eating.

32. Parents should let children fight their own battles.

33. Parents should tell their children what to play as well as when to play.

34. There are times when a child should be allowed to question what his parents tell him to do.

35. Children should be allowed to bring their friends home with them if they want to.

36. It isn't always necessary for a child to show respect to his elders.

37. People deserve respect regardless of how old they are.

38. There are some things that a child should be made to do against his wishes.

39. Parents should never tell a child who he can or cannot have as a friend.

40. At times it's good for parents to be very strict with their children.

41. It is not good for parents to be too easy going with their children.

42. Children should be taught to respect other people's property.

43. Parents should always be strict with their children.

44. A child should be allowed to express himself in any way he pleases.

45. Children are allowed too much freedom nowadays.

46. Children should be allowed to do what they want to do during their play time so long as it's not dangerous.

47. Adults shouldn't have to explain to a child why the child must mind them.

48. There may be times when a child should not do what his elders tell him to do.

49. Children should never be allowed to talk back to their parents.

50. A child should learn to consider other people's wishes before his own.

51. A child shouldn't have to mind his parents all of the time.

52. Parents should never tell a child how to spend his play time.

53. When it comes to something important, a child should be made to mind in a hurry.

54. Children should be taught to say "Please" and "Thank You" and to always use good manners.

55. Children should be kept from getting in things that are none of their business.

56. A child should never be punished for making his likes and dislikes known.

57. At times parents should decide how their child is going to spend his free time.

58. Parents should always know where their children are.

59. Parents should never give in to a child's wishes.

60. A child should be allowed to do as he pleases.

61. If a child tears up his toys, his parents should take them away from him.

62. Parents should know what their children do during the hours they are not in school.

63. There is no need to watch small children all of the time.

64. Children should never be allowed to play in their good clothes.

65. Children should never be allowed to question what their parents tell them to do.

66. A child should be taught that his right to happiness is as important as anybody else's.

67. Parents should do everything in their power to humor a child.

68. It's better to be too strict with children than not strict enough.

69. A child should be allowed to spend his play time the way he chooses.

70. At times an adult should help children settle their disputes.

71. Children should be made to feel that they can express anger openly without being punished for it.

72. A child should always be told why he ought to do what he is told to do.

73. Children who are very young should never be allowed to have their own way.

74. It's better to give a child too much freedom than not enough.

75. A child's wishes should be taken into account more than an adult's wishes.

76. A child should always show respect to his elders.

77. A child should never be made to do chores that he does not want to do.

78. A child should be given as much freedom as he wants in all matters.

79. Parents should never make a child eat food he doesn't like.

80. A child should be taught that he has a right to his own opinion.

81. Children should be allowed to stay up as late at night as they want to.

82. An adult should usually decide how a child should spend his free time.

83. A child should have friends regardless of whether or not his parents approve.

84. Children don't need to bring their friends home with them.

85. A child is naturally selfish until he is taught by his parents to share.

86. Parents should always tell a child why he must mind if he's old enough to understand.

87. Older children should be allowed to stay up as late as they want to, but young ones should be sent to bed early.

88. An adult should always settle children's arguments.

89. A child should mind his parents without asking questions.

90. The fastest way to spoil a child is to let him do as he pleases.

91. It is better to let a child roam around doing about anything he wants than to constantly tell him what he can't do.

92. A child's toys should be his to do with as he pleases.

93. Good parents know that children need some time to themselves.

94. A child should not have any friends his parents do not approve of.

95. A child should be allowed to read whatever he wants to read.

96. Children don't ever need to be by themselves.

97. Sometimes it's all right to let children run wild.

98. At times children should be allowed to wear what they want to wear.

99. Parents should see to it that a child eats some foods which are good for him.

100. A child should be given anything he wants to eat.

101. An adult's wishes should be taken into account more than a child's wishes.

102. A child should do whatever his parents say without question.

103. Children are not always good judges of what is good for them.

104. An adult's opinion should be given more weight than a child's opinion.

105. Children should be taught to obey adults without question.

APPENDIX J.

Instructions For Judging Attitude Statements Concerning The Use of Fear to Control Children's Behavior

(Morning and Afternoon Sessions)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGING ATTITUDE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE USE OF FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR
(MORNING)

In connection with some research that we are doing for Project Head Start, we are supposed to measure the attitudes of some of the parents of children who will be participating this year in the Rural Child Care Project. In particular, we are interested in the parents' attitudes toward child-rearing practices. Because existing attitude questionnaires are not suitable for our research, we have found it necessary to construct our own questionnaires.

Mr. Ellis has kindly offered to assist us in constructing these questionnaires. We need your help because we believe that you are familiar with the kind of language that would be meaningful to and easily understood by the parents of children who are attending Day Care Centers. We have also asked for your assistance because we believe that you will be good judges of the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness toward child-rearing practices that is expressed in the attitude statements that we have devised.

We are specifically interested in constructing two different attitude questionnaires. The first questionnaire will eventually be used to measure attitudes of parents toward the use of fear as a means of controlling the behavior of children. In order to construct this questionnaire, we have made up a large number of statements which we think express some sort of opinion about the use of fear to control children's behavior. We have tried to make some of the statements reflect a favorable attitude toward the use of fear. Other statements were written so that hopefully they would express an unfavorable attitude toward the use of fear. We have tried to make still other statements neutral toward this practice. Finally, we have tried to make the statements we have prepared vary in their degree of favorableness or unfavorableness toward the use of fear so that some are just a little bit favorable or unfavorable; others are mildly favorable or unfavorable; still others are moderately favorable or unfavorable, etc.

A favorable statement would be one which expresses some degree of endorsement or approval of the use of fear to control children's behavior. An unfavorable statement would be one which expresses some degree of condemnation or opposition to this practice. A neutral statement would be neither for nor against this practice.

What we want you to do is to classify each statement according to whether it expresses a favorable or an unfavorable attitude toward the use of fear. We also want you to indicate how favorable or unfavorable you think each statement is. We are aware that each of you probably has his own attitude on this issue. However, we are not trying to measure your attitude but, instead, we are interested in obtaining your judgment as to the favorability or unfavorability of each statement and as to its degree of favorability or unfavorability.

From the large number of statements which you will be given we will eventually select 20 or 25 which, together, will comprise the attitude questionnaire that will be used with Project families. Your judgments will enable us to select statements which will be most easily understood by the families.

Each one of you will be given a number of index cards containing the attitude statements that we have prepared. Only one statement appears on a given card so that you will be given as many cards as there are attitude statements. There are a total of 199 statements, and each statement has been given a number from 1 through 199 for identification purposes. The number of the statement refers only to the order in which the statement will be presented. You will notice on the table in front of you that there are 11 paper markers which are labeled A through K. These markers have been arranged in alphabetical order; the marker labeled "A" is on your far left and the marker labeled "K" is on your far right.

I will read each statement aloud to you while you read along with me silently. Immediately after the statement has been read, we want you to classify it as to its favorableness or unfavorableness toward the use of fear to control children's behavior and, in addition, according to its degree of favorableness or unfavorableness. The paper marker labeled "A" will be reserved for those statements which you think are very much in favor of the use of fear. The marker labeled "F" will be used for those statements which are neutral on this issue (i.e., neither for nor against it). The marker labeled "K" should be used for those statements which you think are very much opposed to the use of fear. The remaining markers should be used for statements which express opinions that are neither neutral, very much in favor of nor very much opposed to the use of fear but which vary between these extremes. Thus, on marker B, you might put those statements which you think express a strong opinion in favor of the use of fear but not quite as strong as the opinion expressed by the statements which you have put on marker A. On marker J you might put those statements which you think express strong opposition to the use of fear but not quite as strong as the opposition expressed by statements which you have put on marker K.

Remember, we are interested in your own judgment of these statements, so do not be influenced by what the person sitting next to you or across from you does. There are no right or wrong answers and your judgments will be used only to assist us in constructing the questionnaire.

Do you understand the procedure? Remember, I will read each of the statements aloud, taking them in turn, while you read along with me silently. Then I will pause for about a minute in order to give you time to judge the statement and to classify it from A to K according to its degree of favorability or unfavorability. Then we will go on to the next statement.

Miss Braswell and I will now illustrate this procedure in the following way. I will read a sample statement aloud to her while she reads along with me silently. I will then pause for about a minute to give her time to decide how to classify the statement. However, instead of actually having her classify the statement, we will illustrate where she would classify the statement once she had made a decision concerning its degree of endorsement of or opposition to the use of fear to control children's behavior.

Here is the sample statement. Are you ready, Miss Braswell?

SAMPLE STATEMENT 0

PARENTS SHOULD NOT THREATEN TO HARM THEIR CHILD'S

PET IN ORDER TO GET THE CHILD TO MIND.

All right, the time is up. If Miss Braswell and I were actually going through the entire procedure rather than merely giving you an example, she would have classified the statement I just read from A to K, depending on its degree of endorsement of or opposition to the use of fear. For example, if she thought that the statement expressed an opinion which was extremely in favor of the use of fear to control children's behavior, she would have put the statement under marker A. If she thought it was very favorable but not quite as extreme as the opinion expressed by statements under A, she would have put it under B. If it was just moderately in favor of the use of fear, she would have put it under C. However, if it was just a little bit in favor of the use of fear she would have put it under D, and if it was just a tiny bit favorable she would have put it under E.

Similarly, if she decided that the statement was extremely opposed to the use of fear to control children's behavior she would have put it under marker K. If it was less extremely opposed, she would have put it under J. If the opinion expressed by the statement was just moderately opposed to the use of fear, she would have put it under I, and she would have put it under H if it was just a little bit opposed. If it was just a tiny bit opposed, she would have put the statement under G. Finally, if she thought that the opinion expressed by the statement was neither for nor against the use of fear to control children's behavior, she would have put the statement under marker F.

Do you all have any questions about this procedure?

Miss Braswell will now give each of you the cards containing the attitude statements. Remember, on marker A, put those statements which you believe express the greatest endorsement of the use of fear to control children's behavior. On marker F, put those expressing a neutral position. On marker K, put those which express the strongest opposition to the use of fear. On the rest of the markers arrange the statements in accordance with the degree of endorsement or opposition expressed in them.

Does everybody have the cards containing the attitude statements? You'll notice that the top card is labeled "Statement 1." Now, before you actually start to make your judgments, I want you to listen as I read the first ten statements to you. Remember, don't start to classify the statements until after I've read the first ten statements to you.

Then we'll go back to Statement 1, I'll read it to you again and then you can classify it. The purpose of reading the first ten statements to you before you start classifying is to give you an idea before you start of the kinds of statements that you will be judging.

Please note that although the sessions will not be timed in the strict sense of the word, we can only allow you about one (1) minute for judging any given statement to keep this session from running all day. During the judging I'll use this watch to keep track of the time. When the time allotted for judging any given statement is up you must classify the statement in one of the categories. If you're not quite sure of the opinion expressed in a statement, classify it as best you can.

If there are any questions we would prefer that you ask them now since any unnecessary noise during the judging might interfere with your concentration. However, if a problem arises after we get started raise your hand and Miss Braswell will come to you. Remember, don't pay any attention to how the others sitting around you classify the statements. We don't expect you to agree with one another on all of these statements.

Please listen as I read the first ten statements. Then we'll go back to Statement 1, and you can classify it.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGING ATTITUDE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE USE OF FEAR TO CONTROL CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR
(AFTERNOON)

Earlier in the day I mentioned to you that we are attempting to construct two separate attitude questionnaires to measure the attitudes of parents toward child-rearing practices. As you well know you spent the morning judging a number of attitude statements in terms of their degree of favorability or unfavorability toward children's rights and liberties.

This afternoon we would like for you to classify an additional set of statements in terms of the opinions expressed in them toward the use of fear as a means on controlling children's behavior. You will be given a new set of statements, each of which pertains, in some manner, to the use of fear as a means on controlling children's behavior. What we want you to do is to again classify each statement in one of the categories from A to K on the basis of the favorability of the opinion expressed in the statement. In other words, we will repeat the same procedure that we went through this morning except, this time, the statements pertain to the use of fear to control children's behavior rather than directly to the issue of children's rights and liberties.

Remember, I will read each statement aloud to you while you read along with me silently. Immediately after the statement has been read, we want you to classify it as to its favorableness or unfavorableness toward the use of fear to control children's behavior and, in addition, according to its degree of favorableness or unfavorableness. The paper marker labeled "A" will be reserved for those statements which you think are very much in favor of the use of fear. The marker labeled "F" will be used for those statements which are neutral on this issue (i.e., neither for nor against it). The marker labeled "K" should be used for those statements which you think are very much opposed to the use of fear. The remaining markers should be used for statements which express opinions that are neither neutral, very much in favor of nor very much opposed to the use of fear but which vary between these extremes.

There are a total of 199 statements, and each statement is numbered in accordance with its order of presentation.

Before you start to classify the statements, please listen carefully while I read the first ten statements to you, taking them in order. Then we'll go back to Statement 1, I'll read it again, and then you can start making your judgments.

Before we begin, are there any questions?

Okay, listen while I read the first ten statements.

APPENDIX K.

Instructions For Judging Attitude Statements Concerning Children's Rights and Liberties

(Morning and Afternoon Sessions)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGING ATTITUDE STATEMENTS CONCERNING CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

(MORNING)

In connection with some research that we are doing for Project Head Start, we are supposed to measure the attitudes of some of the parents of children who will be participating this year in the Rural Child Care Project. In particular, we are interested in the parents' attitudes toward child-rearing practices. Because existing attitude questionnaires are not suitable for our research, we have found it necessary to construct our own questionnaires.

Mr. Ellis has kindly offered to assist us in constructing these questionnaires. We need _your_ help because we believe that you are familiar with the kind of language that would be meaningful to and easily understood by the parents of children who are attending Day Care Centers. We have also asked for your assistance because we believe that you will be good judges of the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness toward child-rearing practices that is expressed in the attitude statements that we have devised.

We are specifically interested in constructing two different attitude questionnaires. The first questionnaire will eventually be used to measure attitudes of parents toward children's rights and liberties--i.e., children's freedom. In order to construct this questionnaire, we have made up a large number of statements which we think express some sort of _opinion_ about children's rights and liberties. We have tried to make some of the statements reflect a favorable attitude toward freedom for children. Other statements were written so that hopefully they would express an unfavorable attitude toward freedom for children. We have tried to make still other statements _neutral_ toward this issue. Finally, we have tried to make the statements we have prepared vary in their degree of favorableness or unfavorableness toward freedom for children so that some are just a little bit favorable or unfavorable; others are mildly favorable or unfavorable; still others are moderately favorable or unfavorable, etc.

A favorable statement would be one which expresses some degree of endorsement or approval of freedom of children. An unfavorable statement would be one which expresses some degree of condemnation or opposition to children's freedom. A neutral statement would be neither for nor against children's freedom.

What we want you to do is to classify each statement according to whether it expresses a favorable or an unfavorable attitude toward freedom for children. We also want you to indicate how favorable or unfavorable you think each statement is. We are aware that each of you probably has his own attitude on this issue. However, we are not trying to measure your attitude but, instead, we are interested in obtaining your judgment as to the favorability or unfavorability of each statement and as to its degree of favorability or unfavorability.

From the large number of statements which you will be given we will eventually select 20 or 25 which, together, will comprise the attitude questionnaire that will be used with Project families. Your judgments will enable us to select statements which will be most easily understood by the families.

Each one of you will be given a number of index cards containing the attitude statements that we have prepared. Only one statement appears on a given card so that you will be given as many cards as there are attitude statements. There are a total of 105 statements, and each statement has been given a number from 1 through 105 for identification purposes. The number of the statement refers only to the order in which the statement will be presented. You will notice on the table in front of you that there are 11 paper markers which are labeled A through K. These markers have been arranged in alphabetical order; the marker labeled "A" is on your far left and the marker labeled "K" is on your far right.

I will read each statement aloud to you while you read along with me silently. Immediately after the statement has been read, we want you to classify it as to its favorableness or unfavorableness toward children's freedom and, in addition, according to its degree of favorableness or unfavorableness. The paper marker labeled "A" will be reserved for those statements which you think are very much in favor of children's freedom. The marker labeled "F" will be used for those statements which are neutral on this issue (i.e., neither for nor against it). The marker labeled "K" should be used for those statements which you think are very much opposed to children's freedom. The remaining markers should be used for statements which express opinions that are neither neutral, very much in favor of nor very much opposed to freedom for children but which vary between these extremes. Thus, on marker B, you might put those statements which you think express a strong opinion in favor of children's freedom but not quite as strong as the opinion expressed by the statements which you have put on marker A. On marker J you might put those statements which you think express strong opposition to children's freedom but not quite as strong as the opposition expressed by statements which you have put on marker K.

Remember, we are interested in your own judgment of these statements, so do not be influenced by what the person sitting next to you or across from you does. There are no right or wrong answers and your judgments will be used only to assist us in constructing the questionnaire.

Do you understand the procedure? Remember, I will read each of the statements aloud, taking them in turn, while you read along with me silently. Then I will pause for about a minute in order to give you time to judge the statement and to classify it from A to K according to its degree of favorability or unfavorability. Then we will go on to the next statement.

Miss Braswell and I will now illustrate this procedure in the following way. I will read a sample statement aloud to her while she reads along with me silently. I will then pause for about a minute to give her time to decide how to classify the statement. However, instead of actually having her classify the statement, we will illustrate where she would classify the statement once she had made a decision concerning its degree of endorsement of or opposition to children's freedom.

Here is the sample statement. Are you ready, Miss Braswell?

SAMPLE STATEMENT 0

CHILDREN SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO VISIT

THEIR FRIENDS IF THEY WANT TO.

All right, the time is up. If Miss Braswell and I were actually going through the entire procedure rather than merely giving you an example, she would have classified the statement I just read from A to K, depending on its degree of endorsement of or opposition to children's freedom. For example, if she thought that the statement expressed an opinion which was extremely in favor of freedom for children, she would have put the statement under marker A. If she thought it was very favorable but not quite as extreme as the opinion expressed by statements under A, she would have put it under B. If it was just moderately in favor of children's freedom, she would have put it under C. However, if it was just a little bit in favor of children's freedom she would have put it under D, and if it was just a tiny bit favorable she would have put it under E.

Similarly, if she decided that the statement was extremely opposed to freedom for children she would have put it under marker K. If it was less extremely opposed, she would have put it under J. If the opinion expressed by the statement was just moderately opposed to children's freedom, she would have put it under I, and she would have put it under H if it was just a little bit opposed. If it was just a tiny bit opposed, she would have put the statement under G. Finally, if she thought that the opinion expressed by the statement was neither for nor against freedom for children, she would have put the statement under marker F.

Do you all have any questions about this procedure?

Miss Braswell will now give each of you the cards containing the attitude statements. Remember, on marker A, put those statements which you believe express the greatest endorsement of children's freedom. On marker F, put those expressing a neutral position. On marker K, put those which express the strongest opposition to children's freedom. On the rest of the markers arrange the statements in accordance with the degree of endorsement or opposition expressed in them.

Does everybody have the cards containing the attitude statements? You'll notice that the top card is labeled "Statement 1." Now, before you actually start to make your judgments, I want you to listen as I read the first ten statements to you. Remember, don't start to classify the statements until after I've read the first ten statements to you. Then we'll go back to Statement 1, I'll read it to you again and then you can classify it. The purpose of reading the first ten statements to you before you start classifying is to give you an idea before you start of the kinds of statements that you will be judging.

Please note that although the sessions will not be timed in the strict sense of the word, we can only allow you about one (1) minute for judging any given statement to keep this session from running all day. During the judging I'll use this watch to keep track of the time. When the time allotted for judging any given statement is up you must classify the statement in one of the categories. If you're not quite sure of the opinion expressed in a statement, classify it as best you can.

If there are any questions we would prefer that you ask them now since any unnecessary noise during the judging might interfere with your concentration. However, if a problem arises after we get started raise your hand and Miss Braswell will come to you. Remember, don't pay any attention to how the others sitting around you classify the statements. We don't expect you to agree with one another on all of these statements. Please listen as I read the first ten statements. Then we will go back to Statement 1, and you can classify it.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGING ATTITUDE STATEMENTS CONCERNING CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

(AFTERNOON)

Earlier in the day I mentioned to you that we are attempting to construct two separate attitude questionnaires to measure the attitudes of parents toward child-rearing practices. As you well know you spent the morning judging a number of attitude statements in terms of their degree of favorability or unfavorability toward the use of fear as a means of controlling children's behavior.

This afternoon we would like for you to classify an additional set of statements in terms of the opinions expressed in them toward children's rights and liberties (i.e., children's freedom). You will be given a new set of statements, each of which pertains, in some manner, to freedom for children. What we want you to do is to again classify each statement in one of the categories from A to K on the basis of the favorability of the opinion expressed in the statement. In other words, we will repeat the same procedure that we went through this morning except, this time, the statements pertain to the issue of children's rights and liberties rather than directly to the use of fear to control children's behavior.

Remember, I will read each statement aloud to you while you read along with me silently. Immediately after the statement has been read, we want you to classify it as to its favorableness or unfavorableness toward freedom for children and, in addition, according to its degree of favorableness or unfavorableness. The paper marker labeled "A" will be reserved for those statements which you think are very much in favor of children's freedom. The marker labeled "F" will be used for those statements which as neutral on this issue (i.e., neither for nor against it). The marker labeled "K" should be used for those statements which you think are very much opposed to freedom for children. The remaining markers should be used for statements which express opinions that are neither neutral, very much in favor of nor very much opposed to children's freedom but which vary between these extremes.

There are a total of 105 statements, and each statement is numbered in accordance with its order of presentation.

Before you start to classify the statements, please listen carefully while I read the first ten statements to you, taking them in order. Then we'll go back to Statement 1, I'll read it again, and then you can start making your judgments.

Before we begin, are there any questions?

Okay, listen while I read the first ten statements.

APPENDIX L.
The Education Scale*

---

*Rundquist, E. A. and Sletto, R. F. Personality and the Depression. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936.

EDUCATION SCALE

Name of Interviewer________________________________ Date______________

Name of Respondent________________________________ County____________
LAST FIRST MIDDLE

Sex____________ Race_____________

How cooperative was this respondent? (Put "X" in the appropriate space.)

________	________	________	________	________
Very Cooperative				Very Uncooperative

On the whole, do you think the respondent's answers reflect his true feelings about education? (Put "X" in the appropriate space.)

________ YES ________ NO

COMMENTS:____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

THE EDUCATION SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: I am going to read some statements to you which are about education. We would like to know how you feel about education. I will read each statement to you twice and then I want you to tell me whether you strongly agree, whether you more or less agree, whether you strongly disagree or whether you more or less disagree with the statement I have just read. If you can't decide how you feel about the statement, just tell me and we will go on to the next one. Okay, do you understand? (Pause)

Here's the first statement:

1. A MAN CAN LEARN MORE BY WORKING FOUR YEARS THAN BY GOING TO HIGH SCHOOL.

   Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

2. THE MORE EDUCATION A PERSON HAS THE BETTER HE IS ABLE TO ENJOY LIFE.

   Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

3. EDUCATION HELPS A PERSON TO USE HIS LEISURE TIME TO BETTER ADVANTAGE.

   Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

4. A GOOD EDUCATION IS A GREAT COMFORT TO A MAN OUT OF WORK.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. ONLY SUBJECTS LIKE READING, WRITING, AND ARITHMETIC SHOULD BE TAUGHT AT PUBLIC EXPENSE.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. EDUCATION IS NO HELP IN GETTING A JOB TODAY.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. MOST YOUNG PEOPLE ARE GETTING TOO MUCH EDUCATION.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION IS WORTH ALL THE TIME AND EFFORT IT REQUIRES.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. OUR SCHOOLS ENCOURAGE AN INDIVIDUAL TO THINK FOR HIMSELF.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. THERE ARE TOO MANY FADS AND FRILLS IN MODERN EDUCATION.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. EDUCATION ONLY MAKES A PERSON DISCONTENTED.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. SCHOOL TRAINING IS OF LITTLE HELP IN MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF REAL LIFE.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. EDUCATION TENDS TO MAKE AN INDIVIDUAL LESS CONCEITED.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. SOLUTION OF THE WORLD'S PROBLEMS WILL COME THROUGH EDUCATION.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. HIGH SCHOOL COURSES ARE TOO IMPRACTICAL.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. A MAN IS FOOLISH TO KEEP GOING TO SCHOOL IF HE CAN GET A JOB.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

17. SAVINGS SPENT ON EDUCATION ARE WISELY INVESTED.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. AN EDUCATED MAN CAN ADVANCE MORE RAPIDLY IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

19. PARENTS SHOULD NOT BE MADE TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO SCHOOL.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

20. EDUCATION IS MORE VALUABLE THAN MOST PEOPLE THINK.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

21. A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION MAKES A MAN A BETTER CITIZEN.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

22. PUBLIC MONEY SPENT ON EDUCATION DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS COULD HAVE BEEN USED MORE WISELY FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Now, which of the following best expresses your feeling about the statement I have just read?

Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX M.
Alternative Phrasing Used For Items on The Education Scale

ALTERNATIVE PHRASING USED FOR ITEMS ON THE EDUCATION SCALE*

1. Do you think that a man can learn more by holding a job than by going to high school?

** 2. A. Do you think that the more schooling a person has the happier he will be in life?

B. Do you think that the more schooling a person has the more he is able to get out of life?

** 3. A. Do you think that our schools are teaching our young people to make better use of their spare time?

B. Do you think that schooling helps a person to make better use of his free time?

4. Do you think that schooling is a great satisfaction to a man out of work?

5. Do you think that courses other than reading, writing, and arithmetic should be taught in public schools?

** 6. A. Do you think that schooling is of any help in getting a job today?

B. Do you think that somebody who has had a lot of schooling is any better off than somebody who hasn't had very much when it comes to getting a job?

---

*The alternative phrasing used for each item was presented in the form of a question because it was felt that this form of the item would be most likely to elicit a response from the attitude respondent. The number given the alternative phrasing used for each item corresponds to the number of the item in its original wording as presented by Rundquist and Sletto.

**For these items the alternative labeled A was first presented to the respondent. In the event that he did not respond, the remaining alternative phrasing(s) was(were) used.

ALTERNATIVE PHRASING USED FOR ITEMS ON THE EDUCATION SCALE* (CONT'D.)

7. Do you think that most young people are getting too much schooling? (too many years)

8. Do you think that a high school education is worth the four years of studying?

9. Do you think that our schools try to teach people to do their own thinking and make their own decisions rather than letting other people think for them?

**10. A. Do you think that too many subjects are taught in school that just aren't necessary?

B. Do you think that too many activities go on in schools?

C. Do you think that teachers are forever changing the way they try to teach something?

11. Do you think that schooling just makes a person unhappy with his lot in life?

---

*The alternative phrasing used for each item was presented in the form of a question because it was felt that this form of the item would be most likely to elicit a response from the attitude respondent. The number given the alternative phrasing used for each item corresponds to the number of the item in its original wording as presented by Rundquist and Sletto.

**For these items the alternative labeled A was first presented to the respondent. In the event that he did not respond, the remaining alternative phrasing(s) was(were) used.

ALTERNATIVE PHRASING USED FOR ITEMS ON THE EDUCATION SCALE* (CONT'D.)

**12. A. Do you think that schooling doesn't help a person handle the problems he will meet in everyday life?

B. Do you think that schooling doesn't help you very much in meeting the problems of later life such as work and raising a family?

C. Do you think that a man who has had a lot of schooling isn't necessarily any better prepared to meet the problems of everyday life than a man who hasn't had much schooling?

**13. A. Do you think that schooling tends to make a person less stuck-up?

B. Do you think that schooling makes a person think he's better than others?

**14. A. Do you think that the world's problems such as poverty, disease, and wars will be solved through schooling?

B. Do you think that the world's problems such as poverty, disease, and wars will be solved through educating people?

15. Do you think that the subjects they teach you in school don't prepare you like they should for working, raising a family, and things like that?

---

*The alternative phrasing used for each item was presented in the form of a question because it was felt that this form of the item would be most likely to elicit a response from the attitude respondent. The number given the alternative phrasing used for each item corresponds to the number of the item in its original wording as presented by Rundquist and Sletto.

**For these items the alternative labeled A was first presented to the respondent. In the event that he did not respond, the remaining alternative phrasing(s) was(were) used.

ALTERNATIVE PHRASING USED FOR ITEMS ON THE EDUCATION SCALE* (CONT'D.)

**16. A. Do you think that a man should keep going to school even if he is offered a job?

B. Do you think that if a man has a choice between working and going to school he ought to go to school (Pause) or do you think he ought to work?

17. If you had savings to spend, do you think it would be a good idea to spend your savings on schooling? (Example: College for your children)

18. Do you think that a man who has had a lot of schooling can get ahead faster in business and industry than a man who hasn't had much schooling?

19. Do you think that parents should not be made to send their children to school?

**20. A. Do you think that schooling is more help to a person than most people think?

B. Do you think that schooling is more worthwhile than most people think?

---

*The alternative phrasing used for each item was presented in the form of a question because it was felt that this form of the item would be most likely to elicit a response from the attitude respondent. The number given the alternative phrasing used for each item corresponds to the number of the item in its original wording as presented by Rundquist and Sletto.

**For these items the alternative labeled A was first presented to the respondent. In the event that he did not respond, the remaining alternative phrasing(s) was(were) used.

ALTERNATIVE PHRASING USED FOR ITEMS ON THE EDUCATION SCALE* (CONT'D.)

**21. A. Do you think that our high schools teach our young people to be better members of their community?

B. Do you think that our high schools teach our young people to be better neighbors?

**22. A. Do you think that tax money spent on schooling for the past few years should have been used for other things such as roads, flood control, etc?

B. Do you think that we have spent too much money on schooling and not enough on other things?

---

*The alternative phrasing used for each item was presented in the form of a question because it was felt that this form of the item would be most likely to elicit a response from the attitude respondent. The number given the alternative phrasing used for each item corresponds to the number of the item in its original wording as presented by Rundquist and Sletto.

**For these items the alternative labeled A was first presented to the respondent. In the event that he did not respond, the remaining alternative phrasing(s) was(were) used.

APPENDIX N.
Community Survey Questionnaire

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

Hello. My name is ______________________ from the Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation. The Foundation is doing a survey in this community to find out how people feel about a number of things which have to do with the welfare of children. Would you mind answering a few questions for me?

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
I. PROJECT EVALUATION SECTION

1. Do you think the present relief and welfare program is a good thing?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

2. Do you think that relief payments are too high, too low or about right?

_____Too High

_____Too Low

_____About Right

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

3. Do you think the government is doing enough for the people or too much or too little?

_____Enough

_____Too Much

_____Too Little

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

4. Do you think that the government should provide free day nurseries or day care centers for children who aren't old enough to enter school?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

KNOWLEDGE OF PROJECT

5a. Are there any of those day care centers in this county? [IF "NO" OR "DON'T KNOW" OR "NO REPLY," SKIP TO ITEM 9.]

_____Yes

_____No

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

5b. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 5A, ASK:] Do you know where these are located? [IF "YES," ASK:] How many are in each location?

_____No

_____No Reply

_____Yes

Locations	Number
______________________________	______
______________________________	______
______________________________	______
______________________________	______

6a. Do you know any of the people who work at these day care centers or for the Rural Child Care Project?

_____Yes

_____No

_____No Reply

6b. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 6A, ASK:] Do you know any of their names?

_____No

_____No Reply

_____Yes (1)________________________________

(2)________________________________

(3)________________________________

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

7a. Do you know anybody who has a child attending any of the day care centers?

_____Yes

_____No

7b. [IF "YES" TO ITEM 7A, ASK:] What are the parent's (s') name(s)?

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

Response: (1)____

(2)____

(3)____

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

GOALS OF PROJECT

8. Do you have any idea what the Rural Child Care Project day care centers are trying to do? [RECORD RESPONDENT'S ANSWER(S)]

_____Yes [ENTER RESPONSE BELOW]

_____No

_____No Reply

Respondent's Statement of Goals* ______________________________

____

____

____

FOR THOSE WHO REFUSED TO ANSWER ITEM 5A OR WHO ANSWERED "DON'T KNOW" OR "NO" TO ITEM 5A, ASK ITEM 9 AND SKIP TO ITEM 12. FOR RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED "YES" TO ITEM 5A, ASK ITEMS 9-14.

---

*For purposes of analysis, responses to item 8 will be classified according to acceptability. Examples of acceptable responses would be: "help children do better in school"; "help children overcome educational handicaps"; "help children and families develop better social, intellectual and safety habits"; "provide day care for those who can't afford it"; and "involve local people in the eradication of poverty."

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

9. What would you say government supported day care centers ought to try to do? [BE SURE TO RECORD THE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO THIS ITEM.]

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

Response ____

____

____

EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT

10. From what you know about the Rural Child Care Project day care centers, do you feel they are doing what they set out to do?

_____Yes

_____Qualified Yes (e.g., "more or less")

_____No

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

11. How well do you think the Project is doing its job?

_____Very Well

_____Fairly Well

_____Very Poorly

_____Fairly Poorly

_____No Opinion

_____No Reply

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PROJECT

12. What do you think about using non-professionals (that is people who lack the formal training ordinarily required by most agencies for that position) to operate government supported day care centers?

_____In Favor

_____Opposed

_____No Opinion

_____No Reply

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION I (CONT'D.)

13. What do you think about using volunteers (people who help out at the center free of charge) in government supported day care centers?

_____In Favor

_____Opposed

_____No Opinion

_____No Reply

FOR THOSE WHO REFUSED TO ANSWER ITEM 5A OR WHO ANSWERED "NO" OR "DON'T KNOW" TO ITEM 5A, OMIT ITEM 14 AND PROCEED TO THE COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SECTION.

---

14. Would you like to see the Rural Child Care Project day care program continued?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Don't Know

_____No Reply

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
II. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SECTION

ASK THE RESPONDENT THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

15. Would you mind telling me the name of the community where you live? [ASK ONLY IF NECESSARY] ____________________

16a. [USE NAME OF COUNTY WHERE INTERVIEW IS TAKING PLACE] That's located here in ____________ County, isn't it? Yes No

16b. [IF "NO" TO ITEM 16A, SAY:] Oh, you don't live here; what county do you live in? ____________________

17. [USE NAME OF RESPONDENT'S COUNTY OF RESIDENCE] How long have you lived in ____________ County? ____________

18. How many people live in your home? ____________

19a. How many children are there in your home who are not yet old enough to go to school? ____________

19b. Would you mind telling me the ages of each of these children?
____

20. If you don't mind, I need to know how many years of school or college you've finished? ____________________

FOR THOSE WHO REFUSED TO ANSWER ITEM 5A IN SECTION I OR WHO ANSWERED "NO" OR "DON'T KNOW" TO ITEM 5A, TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW. BE SURE TO THANK THE RESPONDENT FOR HIS COOPERATION. THEN NOTE THE RESPONDENT'S RACE, SEX, AND ESTIMATED AGE BRACKET ON THE LAST PAGE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. FOR ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS CONTINUE THE INTERVIEW.

21a. Have you--or has anybody else in your home--ever had a child enrolled in a Rural Child Care Project day care center? [CIRCLE ANSWER]

Respondent	Other Household Member
Yes	Yes
No	No
No Reply	No Reply
	Don't Know

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION II (CONT'D.)

21b. [ASK ONLY IF "YES" TO ITEM 21A:] Is the child still attending a day care center? [CIRCLE ANSWER]

Respondent's Child	Other Household Member's Child
Yes	Yes
No	No
No Reply	No Reply
Never Enrolled	Never Enrolled
	Don't Know

21c. [ASK ONLY IF "YES" TO ITEM 21A:] How long was the child enrolled?

Respondent's Child [LEAVE BLANK UNLESS ENROLLED]________________

Other Household Member's Child [LEAVE BLANK UNLESS ENROLLED]_____

22a. Have you--or has anybody else in your home--ever worked as a paid employee of the Rural Child Care Project? [CIRCLE ANSWER]

Respondent	Other Household Member
Yes	Yes
No	No
No Reply	No Reply
	Don't Know

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION II (CONT'D.)

22b. [ASK ONLY IF APPROPRIATE]

Are you still working for the Project? [CIRCLE ANSWER]

Yes No No Reply

[AND/OR]

Is he still working for the Project? [CIRCLE ANSWER]

Yes No No Reply Don't Know

22c. [ASK ONLY IF APPROPRIATE]

How long have you worked (did you work) for the Project? ________

[AND/OR]

How long has he worked (did he work) for the Project? ___________

23a. Have you--or has anybody else in your home--ever served as a volunteer for the Rural Child Care Project? [CIRCLE ANSWER]

Respondent	Other Household Member
Yes	Yes
No	No
No Reply	No Reply
	Don't Know

23b. [ASK ONLY IF APPROPRIATE]

How often have you served as a volunteer? _______________________

[AND/OR]

How often has he served as a volunteer? _________________________

COMMUNITY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: SECTION II (CONT'D.)

TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW

BE SURE TO THANK THE

RESPONDENT FOR HIS

COOPERATION

NOTE: On the basis of observation, circle the respondent's race, sex, and estimated age bracket.

Respondent's Race:	White Negro
Sex:	Male Female
Estimated Age Bracket:	Under 20 Years
	20 - 40 Years
	40 - 60 Years
	Over 60 Years

APPENDIX O.
Instructions For The Community Survey - Indigent Respondents

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COMMUNITY SURVEY - INDIGENT RESPONDENTS

Selecting Respondents

When looking for homes to visit, keep two things in mind: (1) They should be on the main highways and in the target area. (2) Choose homes that are structurally dilapidated. (see second page)

Avoid homes with any indication of being above the poverty level, i.e., new car in yard, boat and trailer, recent home improvements, house recently painted.

Interviewing Respondents

When approaching the home take only the form you will use and your clipboard. Approach the home carefully, avoiding undue inspection or attention to other buildings on the premises. When selecting and approaching homes, use your best judgment. If the occupants are on the porch, approach them unless they indicate that you are not welcome. If no adults are seated on the porch, go to the front door and knock. Explain your purpose while standing on the porch. If possible, administer the scale from the porch. Do not enter the house unless the occupants invite you in. Under no circumstances should you ask any person his name or that of anyone in the home. Even if a respondent tells you his name, do not write it down. Interview the adult who answers the door. If a child answers the door, ask to see either his mother or father. If no adults are at home, then leave. If both are available, interview the person who seems most willing to co-operate. If the occupants indicate that they are not interested in participating, say: "I'm certainly glad you told me how you feel because I don't want to do anything to inconvenience you or disturb you. It was nice meeting you. Thank you." Leave immediately. If they are interested in participating, immediately ask question #1. Do not influence the person's answer. Record his response in the proper space. Follow the instructions for each item very carefully, with special attention being paid to item 5a. At the conclusion of the interview section of the survey, be sure to ask every question on the biographical data section (questions 15-20 for those who responded negatively to question 5a and questions 15-23b for those who responded affirmatively to question 5a). After the interview, thank the respondent for this co-operation. When you have completed this section, immediately after you leave the premises, be sure to note the respondent's race, sex, and age on page 8. At all times be extremely polite and courteous. Do not discuss unrelated topics (i.e., politics, world situation, poverty, etc.). If the person wanders from the subject, gently turn his attention back to the question you are discussing. If you are interrupted by children, neighbors, etc., pause for a few minutes and then attempt to complete the interview if at all possible. The interview should be completed within approximately 20 minutes if possible. In the process of asking questions, do not tell the person what the Rural Child Care Project is, what its goals are, or other information which would prompt him in answering subsequent questions. At the end of the interview, if the respondent indicates that he would like to have more information about the Project, give him the name of the Social Worker in the county.

A dilapidated house must have one or more of the following:

A. One or more critical defects, such as:

1. holes, open cracks, or rotted, loose or missing material over a large area of the foundation, outside walls, roof, chimney, or inside walls, floors, or ceilings.
2. substantial sagging of floors, walls or roof
3. extensive damage by fire, storm or flood

B. Inadequate original construction such that it doesn't provide adequate protection against the elements. Examples of this are:

1. shacks, huts or tents
2. structures with makeshift walls, or roofs or built of packing boxes, scrap lumber or tin
3. structures lacking foundations
4. structures with dirt floors
5. inadequately converted cellars, sheds, barns, garages, etc.

C. Combination of intermediate defects, such as:

1. holes, open cracks, rotted, loose or missing materials in the foundation, walls, roof, floors, on ceilings, but not over a large area
2. shaky or unsafe porch, steps or railing
3. several broken or missing window panes
4. rotted or loose window frames or sash that are no longer rain or wind-proof
5. broken or loose stair treads, or broken, loose or missing risers, balusters, or railings of inside or outside stairs
6. deep wear on doorsills, door frames, outside or inside steps or floors

APPENDIX P.
Community Survey:
Item Summary Comparing Community Leaders and Indigent Respondents

COMMUNITY SURVEY: Item Summary Comparing Community Leaders and Indigent Respondents

1. "Do you think the present relief and welfare program is a good thing?"

	Yes		No		Undecided		Qualified Yes	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	56	53.3	18	17.1	13	12.4	18	17.1
Indigents	89	81.7	4	3.7	6	5.5	10	9.2

χ^2=21.22 df=3 ρ <.001

2. "Do you think that relief payments are too high, too low or about right?"

	Too High		Too Low		About Right		Undecided	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	1	1.0	25	23.8	45	42.9	34	32.4
Indigents	6	5.5	17	15.6	59	54.1	27	24.8

χ^2=7.71 df=3 ρ <.10 >.05

3. "Do you think the government is doing enough for the people or too much or too little?"

	Enough		Too Much		Too Little		Undecided		Need Different Program	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	43	41.0	41	39.0	8	7.6	9	8.6	4	3.8
Indigents	62	56.9	16	14.7	14	12.8	17	15.6	0	0.0

χ^2=22.43 df=4 ρ <.001

4. "Do you think that the government should provide free day care nurseries ...?"

	Yes		No		Undecided		Qualified Yes	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	49	46.7	33	31.4	6	5.7	17	16.2
Indigents	66	60.6	30	27.5	8	7.3	5	4.6

χ^2=9.41 df=3 ρ <.01 (one tailed)

Awareness of Project's Existence

5a. "Are there any of those centers in this county?"

	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	87	82.9	11	10.5	7	6.7
Indigents	74	67.9	25	22.9	10	9.2

$\chi^2=6.95$ df=2 $\rho > .05 < .10$

5b. Frequency and Per Cent Correct on Locations of Centers

	Correct On All County Locations		Correct On At Least One But Not All		Correct On All But Mentioned Another Non-RCC Center		Not Correct On Any Locations Or No Knowledge Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	56	53.3	17	16.2	6	5.7	26	23.7
Indigents	20	18.3	52	47.7	0	0.0	37	33.9

$\chi^2=49.80$ df=3 $\rho < .001$

Frequency and Per Cent Respondents in Each Sample Correct on Number of Centers Located Within the County

	Respondent Named Correct Number		Respondent Unaware Of Project's Existence Or Incorrect On Number	
	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	56	53.4	49	46.6
Indigents	8	7.3	101	92.7

6a. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents in Each Sample Who Claimed to be Acquainted With a Rural Child Care Project Employee

	Acquainted With RCC Project Employee		Not Acquainted With Any RCC Employee But Aware Of Project's Existence		Not Aware Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	78	74.3	9	8.6	18	17.1
Indigents	38	34.9	35	32.1	35	32.1

$\chi^2=35.55$ df=2 $\rho<.001$

6b. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents Who Were Able to Correctly Name a Rural Child Care Project Employee

	Aware of Project's Existence And Able To Correctly Name A RCC Project Employee		Aware of Project's Existence But Unable To Correctly Name A RCC Project Employee		Unaware Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	64	61.0	23	21.9	18	17.1
Indigents*	31	28.7	42	38.9	35	32.4

$\chi^2=39.07$ df=2 $\rho<.001$

*The data for one of the 109 members of the Indigent sample are missing for this item.

7a. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents Who Claimed to be Acquainted With Someone Whose Child Has Been Enrolled in the Child Development Center Program

	Acquainted With Parent Of Child Enrolled In The Program		Not Acquainted With Parent Of Child Enrolled In Program		Unaware Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	31	29.5	56	53.3	18	17.1
Indigents	43	39.4	31	28.4	35	32.1

$\chi^2=14.5$ df=2 $\rho<.001$

8. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents Claiming to be Familiar With Rural Child Care Project Objectives

	Aware Of Project's Existence And Familiar With Program Objectives		Aware Of Project's Existence But Unfamiliar With Program Objectives		Unaware Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	65	61.9	22	21.0	18	17.1
Indigents	29	26.6	46	42.2	34	31.2

$\chi^2=27.12$ df=2, $\rho<.001$

Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents Whose Statement of Rural Child Care Program Objectives Was Essentially Accurate*

	Essentially Accurate		Marginally Accurate		Patently Inaccurate		Unaware Of Project's Existence And/Or Objectives	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	55	52.4	7	6.7	3	2.9	40	38.1
Indigents	22	20.2	3	2.8	4	3.7	80	73.4

$\chi^2=29.15$ df=3 $\rho<.001$

*For purposes of analysis, responses to item 8 were classified according to accuracy. Examples of accurate responses are: "help children do better in school"; "help children overcome educational handicaps"; "help children and families develop better social, intellectual, health and safety habits"; "provide day care for those who can't afford it"; and "involve local people in the eradication of poverty". Examples of marginally accurate answers were "teach them the 'ABC's'", "playing games", and "drawing and painting". Answers such as "babysitting" or "helping children" were scored as patently inaccurate since they were ambiguous and did not indicate awareness of the program objectives.

9. "What would you say that government supported day care centers ought to try to do?"

Response	Leaders f	Leaders %	Indigents f	Indigents %
Opposed to Government Supported Day Care Centers	11	10.5	3	2.8
Get Children Ready For School Or Help Child Advance In School	6	5.7	12	11.0
Teach Basic Skills Or Serve As Extension Of "Regular" School Program	5	4.8	29	26.7
Give Culturally Disadvantaged Children Cultural Enrichment - A "Head Start"	2	1.9	0	0.0
Attend To Children's Health Or Upgrade Them Nutritionally	7	6.7	0	0.0
Emphasize Socialization - Teach Children To Get Along With Others	3	2.9	13	11.9
Combination Of The Above	35	33.3	7	6.4
No Response Given	21	20.0	35	32.1
Unclassifiable	15	14.3	10	9.2

Effectiveness of Project

10. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents Who Believe That Rural Child Care Project is Attaining Its Objectives

	Project Definitely Attaining Its Objectives		Project Is Partially Attaining Its Objectives		Project Is Not Attaining Its Objectives		Undecided Or Unaware Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders	44	41.9	18	17.1	3	2.9	40	38.1
Indigents	33	30.3	9	8.3	0	0.0	67	61.5

11. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents Who Believe That Rural Child Care Project Is Doing A Good Job

	Doing An Excellent Job		Doing A Fairly Good Job		Doing A Fairly Poor Job		No Opinion Or Unaware Of Project's Existence	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community Leaders*	33	31.7	33	31.7	1	1.0	37	35.6
Indigents	22	20.2	21	19.3	0	0.0	66	60.6

*Date for this item for one of the 105 members of the Leader sample are missing. Hence the f's and per cents presented above for members of this sample are based on an n of 104.

6

Attitude Toward Project

12. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents in Favor of Using Non-Professionals to Staff Government Supported Day Care Centers

	Leaders		Indigents	
	f	%	f	%
In Favor	54	51.4	62	56.9
Opposed	19	18.1	30	27.5
No Opinion Or No Reply	5	4.8	15	13.7
In Favor Only If Professionals Unavailable	3	2.9	0	0.0
Generally In Favor But With Some Reservations	24	22.9	2	1.8

13. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents in Favor of Using Volunteers in Government Supported Day Care Centers

	Leaders		Indigents	
	f	%	f	%
In Favor	76	72.4	99	90.8
Opposed	7	6.7	3	2.8
No Opinion Or No Reply	5	4.8	7	6.4
Generally In Favor But With Some Reservations	17	16.2	0	0.0

---

14. Frequency and Per Cent of Respondents In Favor of Continuation of the Rural Child Care Project

	Leaders		Indigents	
	f	%	f	%
In Favor	67	63.8	59	54.1
In Favor But With Reservations	9	8.6	4	3.7
Opposed	7	6.7	2	1.8
Undecided Or No Reply	4	3.8	9	8.2
Unaware Of Project's Existence	18	17.1	35	32.1

APPENDIX Q.
Job Specifications for Rural Child Care Project Program Staff (Professional and Non-Professional)

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Social Work Group
Code No. 4218

CLASS TITLE: Social Worker I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under supervision, performs casework services involving the application of social work principles in the study, treatment and rehabilitation of children and families from depressed, poverty stricken circumstances; provides supervision for total Rural Child Care Project operation assigned to him; and does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Provides protective service work to children and their families manifesting social disorders due to depressed, poverty stricken and isolated circumstances. Investigates and determines whether homemaker services would be beneficial to a family. Establishes and maintains an effective working relationship with the family. Through family counseling and group meetings, assists members of the family in making proper use of their resources and utilizing other resources available to them. Responsible for the recruitment and selection of children for child development service and serves as a liaison between the child development center and the family of the child. Supervises and coordinates child development program and staff. Interprets the program to the community. Supervises homemakers and homemaking program, developing case plans and assessing implementation of them. Maintains up-to-date recording.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Graduation from a recognized college or university preferred but not required.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Working knowledge of current social and economic problems. Ability to prepare concise case histories. Skill in obtaining and analyzing case information and reaching sound judgment on the basis of such information. Understanding of indiviudal, family and community problems and resources. Ability to meet and deal successfully with the public.

Approved: ______________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Social Work Group
Code No. 4215

CLASS TITLE: Case Aide

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under supervision, performs casework services limited to selected cases involving the application of interviewing techniques and carrying out directives toward treatment and following through on the planned aims and objectives set forth in these cases including services rendered to children from the depressed, poverty stricken circumstances; does related clerical-administrative work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Implements case plan under supervision that provides protective service work to children and the families who are manifesting social disorders due to depressed poverty stricken circumstances. Establishes and maintains working relationships with the families, does family counseling such as adult education, use of volunteer and parent group meetings. Assists members of the families in making proper use of their resources and utilizing other resources available to them. Under supervision of the Social Worker, assists with the recruitment and selection of children for child development services and serves as a liaison between the child development center and the family of the children. Interprets the program to the community after counseling with the Social Worker, and helps to interpret and carry out plans of homemaking and other preventive and restorative services as directed. Maintains up-to-date recordings.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Graduation from high school with at least two years of progressively responsible experience. Additional academic qualification in college, vocational education, or technical school may be substituted in lieu of two years of qualified experience.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Knowledge of current social and economic problems in the existing target areas of assigned work stations and ability to follow through in preparing the family history outlines and other administrative forms and directives. Should have some skill in obtaining information regarding these families; basic understanding of individual, family and community problems and resources; and ability to meet and deal successfully with the public.

Approved: ______________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Food & Housekeeping Service
Group
Code No. 8115

CLASS TITLE: Homemaker

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under general supervision, supports, supplements, motivates and teaches inadequate parents in ways and methods to preserve, maintain and strengthen family life for children; and does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Is responsible for teaching mothers individually and in groups how to keep an orderly house, make maximum use of the available resources, and to take better care of children. Assists with and teaches the mother in good standards of housekeeping practices; planning, preparing, and serving meals; household budgeting; good standards of personal hygiene; cultural development; methods of child care, adult education, etc. Participates with the families in the planning and implementing of group meetings and activities. Reports such problems, the solution of which does not fall within the scope of the job, to the Social Worker.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Practical experience in homemaking. Between twenty-one and sixty years of age.

Special Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities: Ability to work constructively with families living in sub-standard conditions and with mental limitations. Considerable knowledge of good housekeeping practices. Good mental and physical health. Stability. Tact. Practical knowledge in rearing children. Ability to benefit from training and experience.

Approved: ______________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Teaching Group
Code No. 3203

CLASS TITLE: Day Care Aide III (Senior Teacher)

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under supervision of the Social Worker, has the immediate responsibility for the health and welfare of the children enrolled in the assigned child development center, and is specifically responsible for implementing the child development program with an assigned class. Does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Is responsible for organizing the child development staff to plan and implement the program for the children enrolled in the center. Plans schedules for the staff, teachers, cooks, maintenance personnel, etc. Plans and implements meaningful volunteer activities. Participates in menu planning and arranges for the purchase of foods for meals and snacks. Keeps records of daily attendance of the children as well as staff attendance. Acquaints parents and children with the rules, regulations and routines of the center. Shares information on the child's adjustment in the center with the Social Worker. Secures proper medical attention for a given child in the event of an emergency and notifies parents through the Social Worker. Participates in staff conferences concerning admissions or discharges. Keeps children's running records with assistance of Teacher and Teacher Aides.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Successful completion of high school or equivalency examination supplemented by two years responsible experience in caring for children. Minimum age of 21 years.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Elementary knowledge of practical psychology and sociology. Working knowledge of general health, safety and personal hygiene. Sympathetic understanding of children and ability to establish and maintain effective relations with children. High moral standards and good personal habits. Good judgment and emotional stability. Calmness in emergencies.

Approved: ____________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Teaching Group
Code No. 3202

CLASS TITLE: Day Care Aide II (Teacher)

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under supervision, implements the child development program with an assigned class; assumes responsibility for the center in the absence of the Senior Teacher; and does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Participates in developing, planning, and implementing the program for the children enrolled in the center. Assists in planning and implementing meaningful volunteer activities. Participates in menu planning. Participates in staff conferences regarding children enrolled in the center. Assists in maintaining children's running records. Acquaints parents and children with rules, regulations, and routines of the center.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Successful completion of high school or equivalency examination preferred, but not required. Two years responsible experience in caring for children. Minimum age of 18 years.

Special Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities: Working knowledge of practical psychology and sociology. Working knowledge of general health, safety, and personal hygiene. Sympathetic understanding of children and ability to establish and maintain effective relations with children. High moral standards and good personal habits. Good judgment and emotional stability. Calmness in emergencies.

Approved: ______________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

General Clerical
Group
Code No. 1438

CLASS TITLE: Clerical Aide

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under direct supervision performs routine stenographic and clerical work in taking and transcribing dictation, and performs additional office work which follows prescribed procedures that can be learned within a reasonable time; and does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Takes and transcribes dictation given at a normal speaking rate. Cuts stencils; types correspondence, reports, forms, tabulations, and other documents from copy or rough draft. Proof reads typed materials for accuracy. Prepares outgoing correspondence from fairly complete and well organized rough notes or verbal instructions. Maintains files of reports, records, correspondence and other material according to established classifications. Contacts persons in the Foundation or in other agencies to collect or give information of a routine nature. May act as a receptionist; screening and referring phone calls and visitors, open, sorts and distributes mail.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Graduation from high school, including or supplemented by courses in shorthand and typing.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Some knowledge of modern office practices, procedures, and equipment, and of business English, spelling, and punctuation. Skill in taking and transcribing oral dictation and in typing accurately from dictating machine, rough draft, or plain copy. Ability to learn assigned clerical tasks within a reasonable time. Ability to adhere to prescribed routines.

Approved: ______________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Semi-Skilled and Skilled Trades
Group
Code No. 7301

CLASS TITLE: Transportation Aide

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under direct supervision operates small transportation vehicle or automobile; and does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Transport children to and from the day care center from those areas in the region which cannot be reached by regular school buses.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Must meet all of the requirements of the County Board of Education for transporting children including adequate insurance coverage.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Working knowledge of light automotive machinery. Considerable knowledge of traffic laws. Ability to follow written and oral instructions. Skill in the operation of light automotive machinery. High moral standards and good personal habits. Emotional stability and good judgment.

Approved: ____________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Food & Housekeeping Service
Group
Code No. 8112

CLASS TITLE: Cook

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under general supervision, performs general cooking duties involving the preparation of foods for a well-balanced diet; and does related work as required.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Prepares and assists in serving breakfast, snacks and a well-balanced noon meal. Bakes, roasts, broils, and fries meat, fish, and fowl. Mixes and/or cooks specialty dishes such as desserts, salads, soups, etc. Seasons foods by taste test and recipe. Keeps record of food used and supply on hand. Assists with the planning of menus, requisitioning food and kitchen supplies and equipment. Is responsible for the care and cleanliness of food preparation and service equipment and facilities. Provides learning experiences for children in food preparation and nutrition. Participates in center program outside of kitchen to the fullest possible extent.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Completion of the fourth grade supplemented by considerable knowledge of food preparation and kitchen maintenance.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Considerable knowledge of the methods used in cooking a variety of foods in large quantities, and of seasoning and cooking time required. Thorough knowledge of cooking characteristics of the various cuts of meats, and of contents of various recipes. Ability to follow oral and written instructions.

Approved: ____________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Social Work Group
Code No. 4227

CLASS TITLE: Social Worker II (Regional Training Supervisor)

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under direct supervision of the Area Training Supervisor, the Regional Training Supervisor plans for and provides on-going training in those counties assigned to him and is responsible for the supervision, through the Social Workers, of those counties.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Holds supervisory conferences with the Social Workers to evaluate and implement child development, social work, and homemaking programs. Reviews county case recordings with the Social Workers. As a result of supervisory conferences, gathers information from which the Training Specialist can build the on-going training program for the child development, social work, and homemaking staffs. Presents on-going training material to the county-level staff. Evaluates each training session held. Evaluates the operation of the daily child development, social work, and homemaking programs. Assists in the recruitment of personnel and interpretation of Project rules, regulations, procedures, and policies. Participates in community meetings for the purpose of interpreting the child development program and to initiate interest and action by the community in assisting the low income families and individuals.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Graduation from a recognized college or university.

Special Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: Knowledge of social work methods and principles and/or early childhood education. Working knowledge of federal, state and local social service programs. Knowledge of current social and economic problems and of individual, family and community problems and resources. High moral standards. Initiative and resourcefulness. Good judgment. Supervisory ability.

Approved: ____________________

Date: May 1, 1968

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.

Social Work Group
Code No. 4230

CLASS TITLE: Social Worker III (Area Training Supervisor)

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLASS: Under the direct supervision of the Project Director, the Area Training Supervisor plans for and provides on-going training and supervision for those Regional Training Supervisors assigned to him and is responsible, through the Regional Training Supervisors, for the Project services in those counties assigned to him.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES: Holds supervisory conferences with the Regional Training Supervisors to evaluate and implement the child development, social work, and homemaking programs. Samples and reviews county case recordings with the Regional Training Supervisors. Makes periodic site inspections of Project facilities in those counties for which he is responsible. As a result of supervisory conferences, gathers information from which the Training Specialists can build the on-going training program for the Regional Training Supervisors. Arranges for the presentation of on-going training material to the Regional Training Supervisors. Evaluates each training session held for those Regional Training Supervisors for whom he is responsible. Supervises and evaluates training provided by Regional Training Supervisors to county staff. Provides technical assistance and performs other training and related duties as required.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

Training and Experience: Master's degree in social work or related social science supplemented by two years of related experience.

Special Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities: Considerable knowledge of social work methods and principles and/or early childhood education. Working knowledge of federal, state and local social service programs. Good knowledge of current social and economic problems and of individual, family, and community problems and resources. Ability to communicate orally and in writing. Investigative and analytical ability. High moral standards. Initiative and resourcefulness. Good judgment. Supervisory ability.

Approved: ______________________

Date: May 1, 1968

APPENDIX R.
The Employee Evaluation Form

KENTUCKY CHILD WELFARE RESEARCH FOUNDATION

EMPLOYEE EVALUATION FORM

NAME:______________________________ (Last) (First) (Middle)

PERIOD:______________________________

FROM:_____/_____/_____ Month Day Year

WORK STATION:______________________________

THROUGH:_____/_____/_____ Month Day Year

JOB TITLE:______________________________

INSTRUCTIONS:
Listed below are a number of traits, abilities, and characteristics that are important for success. Place an "X" mark on each rating scale, over the descriptive phrase which most nearly describes the person being rated.

1. ACCURACY is the correctness of work duties performed.

[3]*	[2]	[5]	[4]	[1]
Usually accurate; makes only average number of mistakes.	Makes frequent errors.	Requires absolute minimum of supervision; is almost always accurate.	Requires little supervision; is exact and precise most of the time.	Careless; makes recurrent errors.

*The number in brackets is the score assigned to the category.

2. ALERTNESS is the ability to grasp instruction, to meet changing conditions and to solve novel or problem situations.

[2]*	[1]	[5]	[3]	[4]
Requires more than average instructions and explanations.	Slow to catch on.	Exceptionally keen and alert.	Grasps instructions with average ability.	Usually quick to understand and learn.

3. CREATIVITY is talent for having new ideas, for finding new and better ways of doing things and for being imaginative.

[5]	[3]	[4]	[1]	[2]
Continually seeks new and better ways of doing things; is extremely imaginative.	Has average imagination; has reasonable number of new ideas.	Frequently suggests new ways of doing things; is very imaginative.	Rarely has a new idea; is unimaginative.	Occasionally comes up with a new idea.

4. FRIENDLINESS is the sociability and warmth which an individual imparts in his attitude toward customers, other employees, his supervisor and the persons he may supervise.

[2]	[5]	[1]	[4]	[3]
Approachable; friendly once known by others.	Extremely sociable; excellent at establishing good will.	Very distant and aloof.	Very sociable and outgoing.	Warm; friendly; sociable.

*The number in brackets is the score assigned to the category.

5. PERSONALITY is an individual's behavior characteristics or his personal suitability for the job.

[4]*	[1]	[5]	[3]	[2]
Very desirable personality for this job.	Personality unsatisfactory for this job.	Outstanding personality for this job.	Personality satisfactory for this job.	Personality questionable for this job.

6. PERSONAL APPEARANCE is the personal impression an individual makes on others. (Consider cleanliness, grooming, neatness, and appropriateness of dress on the job.)

[1]	[3]	[5]	[2]	[4]
Very untidy; poor taste in dress.	Generally neat and clean; satisfactory personal appearance.	Unusually well groomed; very neat; excellent taste in dress.	Sometimes untidy and careless about personal appearance.	Careful about personal appearance; good taste in dress.

7. PHYSICAL FITNESS is the ability to work consistently and with only moderate fatigue. (Consider physical alertness and energy.)

[4]	[1]	[5]	[3]	[2]
Energetic; seldom tires.	Tires easily; is weak and frail.	Excellent health; no fatigue.	Meets physical and energy job requirements.	Frequently tires and is slow.

*The number in brackets is the score assigned to the category.

8. ATTENDANCE is faithfulness in coming to work daily and conforming to work hours.

[5]*	[1]	[4]	[2]	[3]
Always regular and prompt; volunteers for overtime when needed.	Often absent without good excuse and/or frequently reports for work late.	Very prompt; regular in attendance.	Lax in attendance and/or reporting for work on time.	Usually present and on time.

9. DEPENDABILITY is the ability to do required jobs well with a minimum of supervision.

[1]	[5]	[3]	[4]	[2]
Requires close supervision; is unreliable.	Requires absolute minimum of supervision.	Usually takes care of necessary tasks and completes with reasonable promptness.	Requires little supervision; is reliable.	Sometimes requires prompting.

10. JOB KNOWLEDGE is the information concerning work duties which an individual should know for a satisfactory job performance.

[2]	[5]	[4]	[1]	[3]
Lacks knowledge of some phases of work.	Has complete mastery of all phases of job.	Understands all phases of work.	Poorly informed about work duties.	Moderately informed; can answer most common questions.

*The number in brackets is the score assigned to the category.

11. QUANTITY OF WORK is the amount of work an individual does in a work day.

[3]*	[5]	[2]	[4]	[1]
Volume of work is satisfactory.	Very industrious; does more than is required.	Does just enough to get by.	Superior work production recorded.	Does not meet minimum requirements.

12. STABILITY is the ability to withstand pressure and to remain calm in crisis situations.

[5]	[1]	[4]	[3]	[2]
Thrives under pressure; really enjoys solving crises.	Goes "to pieces" under pressure; is "jumpy" and nervous.	Tolerates most pressure; likes crises more than the average person.	Has average tolerance for crises; usually remains calm.	Occasionally "blows up" under pressure; is easily irritated.

13. COURTESY is the polite attention an individual gives other people.

[4]	[2]	[5]	[3]	[1]
Always very polite and willing to help.	Sometimes tactless.	Inspiring to others in being courteous and very pleasant.	Agreeable and pleasant.	Blunt; discourteous; antagonistic.

14. OVERALL EVALUATION is comparison with other employees with the same length of service on this job:

[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Definitely unsatisfactory.	Substandard but making progress.	Doing an average job.	Definitely above average.	Outstanding.

*The number in brackets is the score assigned to the category.

SUMMARY REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

15. Outstanding Qualities:______________________________

____

16. Areas where most improvement needed:____________________

____

17. Recommendations (training, medical, etc.):__________________

____

Signature of Rater	Title	Date
Signature of Employee		Date